

BY

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

with the collaboration of

FLOYD A. CAVE

Acting Head, Division of Social Sciences

San Francisco State College



WILBERT L. HINDMAN

Chairman, Department of Political Science,

University of Southern California



GLENN E. HOOVER

Head, Department of Economics and Sociology,

Mills College



THORSTEN V. KALIJARVI

U. S. Library of Congress;

formerly Professor and Head of the Department of Government,

University of New Hampshire

GOVERNMENTS AND POLITICS ABROAD

EDITED BY

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

*Chairman, Department of Political Science and Sociology
University of Bridgeport*



FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

NEW YORK

Copyright, 1947 and 1948 by
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

2



Copyright Under the Articles of the Copyright Convention
of the Pan-American Republics and the United States.
Printed in the United States of America
by H. Wolff, New York
Designed by Stefan Salter

*Dedicated to
Dean P. F. Valentine
of San Francisco State College
In appreciation*

CONTENTS

Preface		ix
✓1. Great Britain	<i>Wilbert L. Hindman</i>	1
SECTION I	Geopolitical Background	1
SECTION II	The British Commonwealth and Empire	64
SECTION III	Transitional Areas of Empire	96
✓2. France	<i>Floyd A. Cave</i>	111
3. Germany	<i>Floyd A. Cave</i>	150
✓4. Russia	<i>Floyd A. Cave</i>	193
✓5. Italy	<i>Floyd A. Cave</i>	229
6. Spain	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	266
7. Portugal	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	290
8. Switzerland	<i>Floyd A. Cave</i>	297
9. Scandinavian Nations and Finland	<i>T. V. Kalijarvi</i>	319
10. Poland and the Baltic States	<i>T. V. Kalijarvi</i>	342
11. Czechoslovakia	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	363
12. Hungary	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	388
The Balkans	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	407
13. Romania	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	410
14. Yugoslavia	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	436
15. Bulgaria	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	458
16. Greece	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	479
✓17. Turkey	<i>Joseph S. Roucek</i>	506

18. Latin America	<i>Glenn E. Hoover</i>	529
19. Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Chile	<i>Glenn E. Hoover</i>	554
Index		573

PREFACE

During the years following World War I, college and university courses in Comparative Government, Governments and Politics Abroad, and Comparative Foreign Governments were almost entirely devoted to a survey of governments and constitutional developments of the leading countries of western Europe. England, the fountainhead of constitutional democracy, received the most attention in such courses, while France, Italy, Germany, and sometimes Russia, were also briefly surveyed.

The glittering phrases of "constitutionalism" and "parliamentarism," however, proved to be an illusion, first in Italy, and then in Germany, so that the emphasis on constitutionalism in the classroom was replaced by an emphasis on dictatorships and upon the background of political realities as sharply distinguished from the constitutional and legalistic fictions often obscuring the actualities of political processes. But, at the same time, very little, if any, attention was paid to the smaller European countries and especially to the countries of central-eastern Europe. The June, 1944 "Report of the Research Panel on Comparative Government" of the American Political Science Association emphasizes "that we have little reliable information on such major areas as government and politics of the British Dominions, on Latin America (which calls for analytical monographs), on the Scandinavian countries, and the Iberian Peninsula—there is not a single worth-while book on government of Franco-Spain, and even on Belgium and Holland; and how deplorably limited is our knowledge on China and Russia."¹ We should add, however, that the Balkans, an area where World War I was precipitated and where the fortunes of World War II and its aftermath again showed the

¹ Karl Loewenstein, "Report on the Research Panel on Comparative Government," *American Political Science Review*, XXXVIII (June, 1944), pp. 540-548.

importance of the region to world politics, and the Baltic region (together with Poland) where World War II started, are even less known to the student of Comparative Government than are China and Russia.

It is the aim of the present volume not to fill in these serious gaps (which can be done only by a series of monographs on individual countries and particular aspects of their political processes) but to express, as a textbook, the latest trends in the field of Comparative Government and Politics in the most important states of today. Although the chapters on the various countries concerned might appear too brief (a customary criticism of most textbooks), at least the volume contains studies of the countries and regions usually formerly ignored entirely or at least partly overlooked in other texts—that is, Russia, Spain, Portugal, the Scandinavian and Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Balkans and Latin America; China and Japan have been omitted only because the pattern of governments and politics there has not yet crystallized to any considerable degree (although the same criticism can be made in regard to the chapters on Germany and Italy). “If democracy aspires to become universal—and no lasting peace is feasible unless some sort of political homogeneity is established among the nations—it is essential to be informed on the political habitat of other nations, our temporary allies no less than our temporary enemies”—points out the “Report on the Research Panel on Comparative Government.”

In addition, the editor feels that the book possesses several other distinct advantages. The treatment of the various systems has not only utilized the standardized approach to political science, that of descriptive analysis, but it has also brought into play the contributions made by other social science disciplines. This approach is in line with the reasoning propounded again by the “Report of the Research Panel on Comparative Government”: “The artificial wall separating comparative government from constitutional law proper in the limited sense of pragmatic positivism must no less be broken down than the brittle fence segregating international relations from the internal structure of government in the different countries.”

The fact that the book has been prepared by several specialists is of great advantage. The vast bulk of monographs and specialized studies exploring the various aspects of this enormous field has now become so great that even the true specialist finds it diffi-

cult to keep up with it. Growing accumulation of such data, not to speak of the interpretative data, makes it impossible for one person to become expert in many different branches, even in those to be found in his own general field. This book thus demonstrates that there is a periodical need for some integration of the ever-widening range of highly specialized branches of knowledge—a problem introduced by the overwhelming quality of the floods of ever new and sometimes reputable printed matter.

In regard to the frequent comment that the teaching of Comparative Government is now more in the field of History than in that of Political Science, it is necessary to say a few words. This presumption is frankly taken for granted in the present volume, for we are living through a historical period of rapid transitions, characterized by frequent changes in political systems. Under such conditions, the teacher of the Government and Politics Abroad courses can do the only possible thing—and that is to approach the topic historically and to deal with the latest changes on the basis of the available and reputable material. In this respect, this volume treats events “as of the fall of 1946.”

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

“The fall of 1946” concludes the preface just above. During the times immediately ensuing, change in governments and in politics was fast-moving and almost breathless in its rapidity. Both the need of the student in having a record of that flux and the generous acceptance of this book by our fellow teachers of world affairs and political science have strongly indicated the necessity of preparing this Second Edition.

In the belief that *Government and Politics Abroad* has merited its reception as a text in comparative government by virtue of its underlying treatment—the concept that the student may no longer limit his study to the few larger governments but must broaden his horizon to include those countries and regions usually formerly ignored entirely or at least partly overlooked in

other texts, that is, Russia, Spain, Portugal, the Scandinavian and Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, the Balkans, and Latin America—the authors have prepared this Second Edition. To accomplish this, all the chapters have been brought up to date by the addition of summaries of recent events and the trends observable in those events. Suitable additions likewise have been made to the bibliographies.

If anything can be predicted safely, it is that the forms of government taking shape in central and eastern Europe under the shadow of the Iron Curtain will, in any event, condition the future development of governmental patterns and politics elsewhere, at home and abroad. Hence this revised edition is offered for the student of today “as of March 1, 1948.”

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

March, 1948

GOVERNMENTS
AND POLITICS ABROAD

GREAT BRITAIN

SECTION I

GEOPOLITICAL BACKGROUND

Britain and the Empire. The nucleus of the great association of political units which make up the British Empire is England. For all principal governmental purposes, however, this ancient section of the British Isles is the major part of a relatively modern structure known as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. This includes Wales, linked with England since the thirteenth century; Scotland, united with England in 1707 to form the single kingdom of Great Britain; and Northern Ireland, given special status at the time of the creation of the Irish Free State in the period from 1920 to 1922.

The terms Great Britain and British Government are commonly used to refer to the central government in London which rules the United Kingdom. Associated with it in more or less amicable relationships are the governments collectively known as the British Commonwealth of Nations: Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, Eire, India and Pakistan. The balance of the globe-girdling Empire is made up of various types of self-governing and non-self-governing colonies, dependencies, and mandated territories.

Significance to Americans. The British system of government is of first interest to the American student as he looks beyond his own political institutions. The English heritage is fundamental and inescapable. Forty-seven American states have erected their legal systems upon the foundation of the common law of England.¹ The Revolution of 1776 was waged in large part because the "rights of Englishmen" were denied the colonists. Jefferson in writing the Declaration of Independence followed the form

¹ Louisiana is the exception, relying originally upon Roman Law as revived in the Code Napoleon.

of the Bill of Rights of 1688 and used arguments drawn from the English philosopher John Locke, a strong defender of natural rights. The Constitution of 1787 was criticized for its lack of a specific Bill of Rights, yet it mentioned the ancient British guarantees of habeas corpus and trial by jury. Early State constitutions drew heavily from colonial charters for governmental forms and for enumerations of rights. As the United States developed into a world power, social and economic thought has been greatly influenced by the challenging ideas of such men as Jeremy Bentham, Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, George Bernard Shaw, and John Maynard Keynes, to select a random few. And despite past and present differences, the two great English-speaking nations have continued to cherish in common certain basic principles of government and concepts of freedom. This has been reemphasized by the commitments of the Atlantic Charter and by the shared experiences of waging war in alliance twice in a quarter-century against twentieth-century despotism and totalitarianism.

The Sea and the Land. The ocean, both as a barrier and as a pathway of trade and conquest, has been the chief geographical influence in the rise of Britain as a world power. The growth of democratic institutions is attributable in part to the special security afforded by England's island situation. Her people had the opportunity to work out their own problems, protected by sea power from the external threats that constantly menaced the continental nations. Emphasis on naval strength removed the political menace implicit in the existence of a large standing army. History shows that admirals are mostly content with the authority of the bridge and the mastery of the seas. Generals, however, have often led their armies on campaigns of domestic dictatorship. England had her uprisings, it is true, but they were generally spontaneous expressions of discontent, rather than the machinations of a power-hungry professional soldiery.

The land area of the United Kingdom is 94,663 square miles, or smaller than that of Oregon. England proper is only 50,870 square miles, or a little larger than New York. Although the British Isles are located in the same latitudes as Kamchatka and the Coast of Labrador, marine currents maintain the climate at a temperate level. There is generous precipitation to maintain the short, leisurely flowing rivers. Nowhere are there magnificent spectacles of snow-clad peaks, deep river gorges, or vast plains.

The highest elevations run mostly between three and four thousand feet, and occasionally slightly higher in Scotland. The gentleness of the terrain makes it quietly pleasing rather than majestic. The moderate temperatures and frequent rains—with brief winter snows—make landscapes lush with vegetation and gardens vivid with color.

Of natural resources, the islands are provided with coal and iron. These, with the earlier timber available, have been the physical roots of the shipbuilding industry which produced the merchant fleets and navies carrying British trade and politics to all the corners of the earth. The addition of air to sea power, and the mechanism of the modern warship, has made the lack of petroleum at home a key to British policy in certain areas, notably the Near East. Other mineral supplies are sparse or entirely lacking.

Population pressure has long taxed Britain's agriculture to the limit. Some 48,500 square miles are devoted to crops and pasture, but this is not enough to provide sufficient food for domestic consumption. The shipping crisis in World War II necessitated energetic emergency measures for the production of additional supplies of food for direct human consumption. While some additional acreage was obtained by reclaiming waste land and by utilizing parks and public grounds, this was somewhat more than offset by the erection of new factories and the creation of numerous air bases and other military establishments on land normally used for farming. By turning grassland to the plow, however, it was possible to increase output by some 70 per cent in terms of calories and protein. Aided by the rationing program, this enabled basic needs to be taken care of with a reduction of 50 per cent in food imports.²

The People. Britain's position as a world power was not secured by the inanimate environment. It was obtained by a people with a special character associated with their origins and their way of life. The British Isles were peopled by waves of adventurers beginning long before the Christian era. By the time Julius Caesar set foot on British soil in 55 B. C., there had already occurred a succession of invasions and conquests by various Celtic tribes. Although the Romans kept an uneasy control of the land

² A summary review of the British economy throughout the major part of the war is to be found in *Statistics Relating to the War Effort of the United Kingdom*, Cmd. 6564 (1944).

for four hundred years, the coastal areas continued to experience sporadic forays by the Nordic barbarians. The withdrawal of the legions of Rome opened the land to new ferocities of attack. Settlements were established and wiped out. Tiny regional kingdoms and principalities rose and fell in the course of turbulent centuries.

In the sixth and seventh centuries, Christianity came to England. It was introduced from the west by priests from Celtic Ireland, and from the south by Augustine, a missionary sent by Pope Gregory the Great. At this time the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes had won control of England, and Augustine began his work with the baptism of Ethelbert, King of Kent. The extension of the influence of the Church brought religious unity over a wide area. Political unity, however, was wanting so long as the invasions continued. In the ninth century the Vikings nearly overcame the island and were checked by Alfred the Great about 878. In the eleventh century the Danes were successful in establishing supremacy under Canute. The sons of this monarch proved incompetent as rulers, and England again became independent under Edward the Confessor, who ruled from 1042 to 1066. Edward died without heir, and his successor, Harold, proved no match for the invading Normans, themselves descendants of the Vikings.

In the period following 1066, England was free from further population increases by conquest. Although refugees from European conflicts and oppression added substantial numbers of immigrants at certain periods, notably in the sixteenth century when Flemings and Huguenots found sanctuary in Britain, the people today are descended chiefly from the ancient warrior stocks of the Celts, Angles and Saxons, Danes and Normans. Britain's capacities in warfare by sea, in settlement and colonization, in territorial acquisition and political domination, thus stem from the millennium-old circumstances which led to the creation of her own civilization.

Today the population of the United Kingdom is something under 48,000,000, and that of England proper about 40,000,000. The birth rate is low, as is the case in highly industrialized societies. In England it is under 18 per thousand, and in Scotland a little higher. Population growth in the past has been slowed considerably by emigration to the United States and to such parts of the Empire as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and

South Africa. Even before the war, however, restrictions were slowing down the movement from the homeland, and further limitations in Canada and elsewhere will still further reduce this flow. Nevertheless the trend toward a declining population continues. This may be contrasted with the increases in other parts of the world. In India, for example, in the past ten years the net addition to the population has been around five million annually—the total in a decade equalling the entire population of the United Kingdom.

The bulk of the British people live in urban areas. The largest metropolitan concentration in the world is in greater London, the figure reaching close to 9,000,000, or about one in every five Britons. Another great cluster of population is in the industrial lowlands to the north of London. The population density for England proper is 767, as against 495 for Japan, 197 for France, and 376 for Germany.

The Economy. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, England became a nation of first industrial importance, the "workshop of the world." Invention and the factory system created a machine economy producing growing quantities of fabricated goods for export, and in turn fed by huge imports of raw materials. Over 51 per cent of the working population is engaged in industrial activity, a greater proportion than in any other country. In 1939 the principal exports were iron and steel products, including machinery and vehicles, coal, cotton and woolen goods, electrical goods, and whiskey. Imports in order of value were butter, petroleum, raw wool, wheat, bacon, tea, raw cotton, beef, tobacco, mutton and lamb, sugar, hides and skins, corn, and copper.

In addition to her industrial and shipping importance, Britain has long served as the world's financial center. Her total economy has provided per capita wealth and income superior to any of the continental nations, although far below the United States. However, there has been a considerable maldistribution of this wealth and income. Starvation was still listed in vital statistics in England until well into the nineteenth century. The impact of foreign competition, war, and world economic recession had created in England prior to 1939 areas of industrial stagnation in which groups of workers had been without jobs for years. These people ultimately came to be termed, with doubly ap-

propriate meaning, the "depressed classes." The war ended unemployment and raised the national income from about \$20 billion in 1938 to some \$36 billion in 1945.

The entire fiscal picture has been altered by the impact of the war. While in 1939 some 18 per cent of Britain's national wealth was invested abroad, today these foreign obligations have largely been liquidated. Formerly a great creditor nation, the British have become debtors in places like India. Losses of revenue from these sources place additional emphasis on the imperative necessity of expanding postwar exports. Trade continues to be the life of Britain.

The economic as well as the political impact of two gigantic wars, with a period of prolonged economic depression in the interim, has presented the government with a postwar challenge in four principal phases: (1) reconstruction at home; (2) reconstitution in the Empire; (3) development of foreign markets; and (4) the creation of international institutions underwriting a stable peace. The policies of Britain cannot be fairly interpreted unless placed against these needs. The devastated home areas must be rebuilt, and new access to prosperity must be provided to many groups. The restless Empire requires placation without the severance of commercial ties. The expanded capital plant of the United States, together with the certain increases of exports from the Soviet Union, Canada, and elsewhere, present critical problems in the formulation of tariff and trade agreements. International peace, to be more than a Lacedaemonian truce,³ must bring power politics within the framework of a world security structure based upon expanding trade and rising standards of living generally.

These are large orders, but to fail means disaster to England. If that befalls, the world will not be a better place. Ralph Waldo Emerson, after two visits to England, wrote a series of essays published in 1856 under the title *English Traits*. Among his conclusions was this: "The stability of England is the security of the modern world. If the English race were as mutable as the French, what reliance? But the English stand for liberty. The conservative, money-loving, lord-loving English are yet liberty-

³ The Peace of Pericles in 455 B. C. provided a "Thirty Years' Truce" between the forces of Sparta and Athens. It lasted only fifteen years, and ended when, according to Thucydides, "The growth of the power of Athens, and the alarm which this inspired in Lacedaemon, made war inevitable."

loving; and so freedom is safe: for they have more personal force than any other people.”⁴

ELEMENTS OF THE BRITISH SYSTEM

The Pattern of Growth. It is difficult at first glance to discern the order which underlies the diversity of British political institutions. Many elements appear discordant, and suggest a lack of consistency and proportion. Democracy goes hand in hand with monarchy; the King announces programs of industrial socialization in his addresses to Parliament; the House of Lords has its Labor Peers; clergymen are barred from the House of Commons, yet Bishops sit in the Lords; there is religious liberty and an established Church; some electors have two votes. These are but a few of the sources of confusion.

It is in fact futile to insist upon the reassuring comfort of neat form and precise articulation among all the elements of the British system. As with any other complex arrangement of interpersonal and intergroup relations, the people and the behavior patterns which make up the government function according to practical adaptations bolstered by well-meant but often inaccurate theories. Hobson and other writers⁵ have pointed out that metaphors are frequently misleading in the social sciences. To refer to government as a “structure” or a “machine” immediately suggests unity, integration, clear relationships, and evident purpose. The truth is that any governmental organization is essentially a series of working compromises, subject to experiential validation, whereby conflicting forces may be adjusted in an effort to advance the well-being of the various participating groups.

The forces which account for the form of government in Britain today are of several kinds. The first set of influences stems from history. As new political institutions appeared, old ones have not been entirely supplanted and vestiges of them cling tenaciously to the present system. While the Cabinet and Commons are today the principal sources of policy, the King yet re-

⁴ Brooks Atkinson, Ed., *The Complete Essays and Other Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York: The Modern Library, 1940), p. 598.

⁵ J. A. Hobson, *Free-Thought in the Social Sciences* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1926). For an American view, see Thurman Arnold, *The Symbols of Government* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935).

mains as a ceremonial representation of bygone power and of continuing imperial unity. Royal approval of legislation is a foregone conclusion, yet laws are still passed under the ancient form: "Be it enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows." As a father-symbol, the King is comforting to his subjects, and his majestic eminence lends authority to law. Englishmen of all classes enjoy a real satisfaction of status by virtue of membership in a system headed by "George the Sixth, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India."

Other historical implementations of the modern government are found in the elaborate ritual which is part of almost every public activity. From the pomp and circumstance surrounding the coronation of a King, to the mace which is the Speaker's symbol of authority in Commons, the English have shown a flair for bridging the centuries and maintaining communion with antiquity.

A second source of formative pressure on political behavior in Great Britain comes from the continuation of aristocratic concepts throughout the period of development of democratic procedures. Compromises on this front are myriad. Among them is the continuation of the House of Lords with its largely hereditary membership. Again, while voting in Britain is conducted on a broad basis of eligibility, there is class preference implicit in the double vote granted to persons owning certain types of property and to graduates of some of the universities. Moreover, the administrative class in the Civil Service attracts much personnel from the wealthier and titled classes.

A third area from which forces emanate to complicate the British picture is the Empire. An empire is not an eleemosynary institution; it is a power structure and a commercial enterprise. It exists for profit and for security. Britain today must endeavor to continue traditional family ties with the increasingly independent Commonwealth nations. She must also face the growing restlessness of native peoples in many parts of the Crown Colonies, particularly those from which the British were expelled by enemy action during the war. The colonies and, especially, the mandates must be administered with a wary

eye on world opinion. The imperial picture is further affected by the rising demand for a world standard of human rights, and by the pressures of rival powers. Food, gold, and oil flow through the lifeline of Empire, and this leads to practices and policies often appearing alien to the domestic scene.

Technology provides the fourth element in the growth of modern Britain. Industrial expansion has been based upon specialization, leading to an intricately interdependent society. Demand for mass factory labor led to largely unplanned urban concentrations with their aggravated human problems of bad housing, disease, poverty, and crime. The movement to socialism in England is an ultimate recognition that government alone possesses the authority to integrate the activities and meet the needs of all the groups contributing to the national economy. War, of course, has greatly intensified the role of technology and the need for rational direction of the economy as it is reoriented toward peace.

There is, finally, an ideological background to the rise and fall and adjustment of institutions. Political and social theory is often challenged for serving in retroactive validation of changes already accomplished. If so, then theory contributes helpfully to clarify the present state of affairs. Walter Bagehot wrote his classic work, *The English Constitution*, in 1867, and rendered great service by providing for the first time a clear and long-delayed account of the operations of Cabinet government.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt but that much in the way of change and reform has resulted from the impact of ideas upon the course of events. From the days of Wycliffe and the Lollards, ideas have supported action in the growth of the circumstances of freedom in England. Adam Smith's great work, *The Wealth of Nations*, appearing in 1776, helped to end the era of mercantilism. Jeremy Bentham's *Fragment on Government*, published the same year, founded the liberal doctrine that government should seek the greatest good of the greatest number. Karl Marx was of continental origin, but he resided in England and was subsidized by English capital through an industrialist's son, Friedrich Engels. The Marxist challenge to capitalism has been met in England by democratic humanitarianism and by a moderate socialism of reason and nonviolence. The conscience of the established Church has enlisted on the side of social reform, in the pronouncements of leaders like William

Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury.⁶ John Stuart Mill and other nineteenth-century liberals contributed much through their writings to the broadening of the suffrage and other steps toward more complete democracy.

These are not the only factors which have molded the shape of British institutions, by any means. But the vitality of historical institutions, the clash of aristocracy and democracy, the magnificent and troublesome complex of Empire, the impact of technology as intensified by the shocks of war, and the inspiration and compulsion of ideas have in large measure made the Britain of today. The resultants of these forces are not always consistent or clear, and they do not fall readily into neatly contrived categories. It must be reemphasized that the government is not a machine, and its parts therefore do not always mesh in close tolerance, even when smoothed by unctuous oratory on occasions of state.

CONSTITUTIONAL GROWTH

Britain stands alone among the great powers in her lack of a written statement of fundamental law. Beginning with the American precedent in 1787, the practice of formulating on paper the structure and principles of current government spread throughout the world. World War I created such new national governments as those of Ireland and Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia, all of them predicated upon the formalities of constitutional documents. The institutional devastation of World War II is likewise bringing substantial constitutional revision in its wake. France's Fourth Republic, Brazil, and Japan are principal instances of constitutional change already accomplished. Britain is embarking upon a sweeping program of socialism which involves many political as well as economic adjustments, but these are proceeding entirely upon the basis of popular understanding and Parliamentary enactments.

The fact that the American federal system is based upon forty-nine written Constitutions often confuses the student who seeks to grasp the elusive concept of the British Constitution.⁷

⁶ A practical program of social betterment is suggested in the Appendix to his essay, *Christianity and Social Order* (New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1942).

⁷ By focusing his attention too closely upon these written Constitutions in America, the student sometimes fails to see the living practices underlying his own government.

The government of England is grounded upon practices and principles established as custom. The Constitution, very simply, consists of the more important offices and agencies of government, including the King, Cabinet, Parliament, Courts, and Civil Service, together with the fundamental principles to which these must conform, such as the supremacy of law, due process of law, civil liberties, free elections, and majority rule. While a few portions of such a Constitution are embodied in actual historic documents, for the most part it is a matter of general understanding; of common agreement. Technically, Parliament may at any time sweep away any of the existing system—the King, for example, or the House of Lords. But the present form of government is more firmly protected from whim or demagoguery than this might suggest. In the schools, the homes, and the churches, in discussions in private and public meetings, in political campaigns and at Party conferences, in the activities of voting and public service, in the endless editorializing and writing of letters-to-the-editor, and a host of other ways, the Englishman learns of the growth and the characteristics of his political system. In the tradition of Edmund Burke he views askance the excesses of the French Revolution, and stands appalled at the ruthlessness displayed in the Soviet Union. He is obviously not averse to change and improvement, but he is cautious, recalling Burke's observation in the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, "I think our happy situation owing to our constitution; but owing to the whole of it, and not to any part singly; owing in a great measure to what we have left standing in our several reviews and reformatations, as well as to what we have altered or super-added."⁸

The centuries of British constitutional growth have been highlighted by the gradual diminution of the power of the King, and the accretion of authority by Parliament. In the present century, ascendancy in the legislature has clearly been won by the House of Commons. Today the Prime Minister and his fellow ministers in the Cabinet form the actual executive authority in the government, and retain their positions only so long as they receive the support of the majority in Commons. Accompanying this development, and inseparable from it, has been an extension of civil liberties, particularly free speech, and an expansion of the suffrage.

⁸ *The Works of Edmund Burke* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1894), Vol. II, p. 516.

This process has had its economic and ideological aspects. Historically, groups have generally obtained economic power first, then used this power to exact concessions from those who held political authority. The cry in the American Revolution, "No taxation without representation," revealed a shrewd awareness of the traditional English way to impress a King.

At the same time the role of the organizer and agitator, the militant reformer within the churches and without, was important. Free speech in England cannot be considered without hearing the brave cry of Latimer as he perished in the flames to which he and a comrade had been condemned: "Be of good cheer, Master Ridley, for we have this day lit such a candle in England as shall, with God's grace, never be put out."

The long march toward democracy began at Runnymede in 1215, when John's principal vassals secured the Magna Carta. Embodied in the agreement was the important principle that the ruler accepted the paramountcy of law in his dealing with these subjects. He also agreed to consult the military and ecclesiastical leaders before levying extraordinary taxes, and to refrain from arbitrary punishment and imprisonment. In the years that followed, the Great Charter was often ignored, and ultimately forgotten, until its rediscovery by Coke and Selden at the time of the quarrels between absolutist James I⁹ and the propertied classes at the turn of the seventeenth century. The Petition of Rights was consented to by Charles I in 1628, but then ignored. John Milton wrote his militant essay on freedom of expression, the *Areopagitica*, in 1644, in opposition to an act providing censorship of publication. "For who knows not that Truth is strong, next to the Almighty?" he inquired. "She needs no policies, nor stratagems, nor licensings to make her victorious; those are the shifts and the defenses that error uses against her power."¹⁰ Milton's polemic was instrumental in thwarting enforcement of the censorship. After a brief revival of the act under the Stuarts, it lapsed permanently in 1695.

Cromwell sought from 1649 to his death in 1658 to establish a republican system, but without success. At one time he resorted

⁹ James vigorously defended his position in such works as *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598).

¹⁰ Compare this argument with Jefferson's remark in his First Inaugural Address: "If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

to a written Constitution, the Instrument of Government. Discord among his followers in Parliament, however, led him to fall back upon military rule. The short-lived restoration after Cromwell ended in 1688 with the Glorious—and bloodless—Revolution. The Bill of Rights accepted by William and Mary prohibited the King from interfering with the due process of law, and levying taxes or maintaining an army without Parliamentary consent. Basic civil rights, including habeas corpus, were reaffirmed, and freely elected Parliaments were to be held frequently, with the members guaranteed freedom of speech.

This was the turning point for democracy. In 1690 appeared John Locke's *Two Treatises of Civil Government*, providing a full theoretical justification for the newly established restrictions on the sovereign. Locke's appeal to men of property was influential everywhere, and contributed profoundly to liberalism in America and France, as well as in England. The principles he stressed are still fundamental to democracy: "These are the bounds which the trust that is put in them by the society and the law of God and nature have set to the legislative power of every commonwealth, in all forms of government. First: They are to govern by promulgated established laws, not to be varied in particular cases, but to have one rule for rich and poor. . . . Secondly: These laws also ought to be designed for no other end ultimately but the good of the people. Thirdly: They must not raise taxes on the property of the people without the consent of the people given by themselves or their deputies. . . . Fourthly: The legislative neither must nor can transfer the power of making laws to anybody else, or place it anywhere but where the people have."¹¹

The tempo of democratic advance stepped up in the two and a half centuries following the Revolution. The King's reliance upon his ministers, and their dependence in turn upon Parliament, increased. Finally the King found it desirable to single out one principal minister for advice in the determination of policy and in securing the financial and legislative cooperation of the legislature. The first recognized Prime Minister was Sir Robert Walpole, who served from 1721 to 1742. His resignation because of an adverse vote in Parliament established the principle of ministerial responsibility which is still basic to the Cabinet system.

¹¹ John Locke, *Two Treatises of Civil Government* (New York: Everyman's Library, 1924), Bk. II, Ch. xi.

Political parties were imbued with added vitality as the Cabinet became the focal point of policy. In the nineteenth century, agitation for the extension of the suffrage and other reforms became widespread. The London Workingmen's Association was founded by William Lovett in 1836, and issued a Charter calling for the adoption of the following six points: (1) Manhood suffrage; (2) Voting by secret ballot; (3) Payment of Members of Parliament; (4) Annual Parliaments; (5) Abolition of property qualifications for Members of Parliament; and (6) Equal electoral districts. The Chartist program was regarded by many as dangerously extreme, but its proposals are now law. Women received the franchise in the measures of 1918 and 1928. The Parliament Act of 1911 removed from the House of Lords any power to do more than delay the final passage of bills approved by the House of Commons.

The growing social welfare program of the government, dating back to the earliest Factory reform measure of 1819, became frankly socialistic in 1945. The popular rights won through a thousand years of struggle are now to be turned to new purposes of collective benefit.

THE CONSTITUTION TODAY

As the middle of the twentieth century approaches, Britain has become a parliamentary democracy in the fullest sense. In free elections the large electorate selects the members of the House of Commons. The majority party within the Commons generally designates the Prime Minister, whose appointment by the King is a formality. The new executive leader then chooses his "government," consisting of the ministers who will each assume some important administrative responsibility, most commonly as head of a department. The Cabinet is made up of those ministers who have greatest authority and who work most closely with the Prime Minister in the formulation and direction of policy. At all times, however, the ministry is collectively responsible to the House of Commons, and must secure from that body approval of its official actions, as well as support of a legislative and financial character. In the event that the Prime Minister or one of his associates fails to secure the necessary majority in Commons, the government "falls," the ministers resign, and a new

government is constituted, often after another general election has been held.

The House of Lords contributes some members to the ministry, and adds its judgment and advice to the work of the Commons, but is distinctly a secondary influence. In the background of policy, though in the forefront of eminence, is the King. Although without active authority, he retains his rank and dignity, and plays a role which is of vast importance in the conduct of the nation's affairs, particularly in time of crisis. He is a symbol, but a symbol of security and power, of ancient fulfillment and future promise.

The individual citizen enjoys the hard-won civil rights of freedom of speech and press, assembly and petition, religious liberty, and due process of law. The Courts have no power to interfere with legislative acts, as is the case in the United States. Although Northern Ireland and Scotland have certain special autonomy in the United Kingdom, the government is essentially unitary. Expansion of activities in accordance with socialistic objectives is extending the influence of the central government more and more in the field of local government.¹²

SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS

Expansion of the Electorate. With the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, the economy of England was hard hit by unemployment and inflation. Rural and urban workers were in a miserable plight, and the rich used their political influence to shoulder an increasing burden of taxation upon the unenfranchised masses. Not only was the right to vote limited, but property holders among the middle classes were inequitably represented. The House of Commons apportionment had remained stationary, even though vast shifts had occurred in the population. Thus huge industrial cities had grown up with little or no representation, while the older boroughs dwindled in size or, as in the case of Downton, disappeared into the sea. Handfuls of freemen chose representatives for these "rotten boroughs."

¹² The student will find a useful sketch of the present government in W. A. Robson, *The British System of Government* (London and New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1940), written as part of the "British Life and Thought" series. See also W. Ivor Jennings, *The British Constitution* (Cambridge: University Press, 1941).

Purchase of seats was common practice, and the wealthy thus obtained even more of a monopoly on Parliamentary offices.

While a few halting reforms were granted, the Tory government for the most part dealt with manifestations of unrest by repression rather than amelioration. The opposition grew stronger, however. The humanitarian implications of Bentham's utilitarianism attracted persons in all classes to the support of positive reform. Journalists like William Cobbett wrote cogently of the need for Parliamentary changes if the lot of the workers was to be improved.

The Reform Bill of 1832 was the product of this cauldron of censure. Even so, Earl Grey's proposal was blocked for a time by the adamant House of Lords. Finally the King agreed to take the extreme step, if necessary, of creating sufficient additional peers to ensure the approval of the bill in the upper chamber. The Lords retreated from this threat, and the bill passed. The readjustment of constituencies and modification of the property requirements gave additional representation to the middle classes, but left the masses of urban and rural workers without votes.

When the moderate character of the reform became evident, there was renewed pressure for further changes. The Chartists and other groups demanded suffrage for the workers, but not until the Reform Bill of 1867, sponsored by Disraeli, was there a further reapportionment of seats in the House of Commons and a substantial reduction in property qualifications. Additional suffrage rights were granted in 1884, with a redistribution of constituencies in 1885. Voting continued, however, to be restricted to males, and to be associated in some way with property.

A few women had joined the movement for political recognition in the nineteenth century. They were inspired by such courageous individualists as Mary Wollstonecraft, whose book, *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*, appeared in 1792. Little progress was made, however, and the prospect of the Suffragists, led by Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughters, appeared dismal prior to World War I. The war, however, brought women from the homes to the factories in great numbers. Again social and economic power became a prerequisite to the achievement of political influence. When the Representation of the People Act was passed in 1918, not only were all adult males enfranchised, but women who were occupants of property or wives of

occupants were given the right to vote if they had reached the age of thirty. In 1928 the Conservatives swept away the remaining discriminations, and the "flappers" were added to the lists of eligibles.

Present Provisions. Today virtually every British subject twenty-one years of age and over is entitled to vote in Parliamentary elections, provided he has lived in any constituency or in an adjoining one for at least three months before the voters' register is made up. One additional vote may be obtained if a person is a graduate of one of the institutions of higher learning represented in the twelve functional "University constituencies," or if he occupies business property in a constituency other than the one in which he has personal residence. Obviously this permits some individuals to qualify on more than two counts, but legally such persons must limit themselves to not more than two votes. Since there is no check on abuses of this regulation, some energetic persons may vote more than twice without detection.¹³ In the British armed forces absentee voting is provided for as a matter of course. Disqualifications include criminals and idiots in public confinement, aliens, paupers in institutions, and persons convicted of certain corrupt practices at elections. Until 1945, property qualifications continued to bar certain persons from the polls in local elections, even though they might participate in national balloting. On the other hand, members of the peerage cannot vote in Parliamentary elections, because of the representation in the House of Lords, but they may vote in municipal contests.

Election Administration. Widely neglected in the study of democratic government is consideration of the importance of honesty and accuracy at the polls, both on the part of voters and of election officers. Yet without an accurate count of votes cast by legally qualified voters who are expressing their honest personal sentiments, democracy cannot exist. Corrupt election officials, irregular voting, and bribery and intimidation are thus important challenges to the validity of any indication of electoral choice. Great Britain has, on the whole, met this problem effectively.

The Reform Act of 1832 first required registration of eligible voters as part of the election system. Today the register of voters

¹³ The practice of "voting early and often" is American, rather than British. See Mr. R. Werner, *Tammany Hall* (2nd ed.; Garden City, N. Y.: Garden City Publishing Co., 1932).

is maintained annually on the basis of an official, door-to-door survey. The irregular use of money by individual candidates is checked by the requirement of full publicity. All moneys used in the campaign must be expended through one person, either the candidate himself or, more commonly, through his treasurer. Corrupt and illegal practices are regulated by an act passed in 1883, with subsequent additions. In general, a corrupt practice will void an election, while illegal practices do not. Corrupt practices include bribery, treating, undue influence, personation, a false return of election expenses, and making certain expenditures without the written authority of the person officially designated as election agent for the candidate. Illegal practices are certain acts specifically prohibited by law, involving the use of money, preparation and filing of reports, and voting. The British regulations in this field have been widely followed in the development of corrupt-practices legislation in the United States.

Not all phases of political finance are made public, however. The amount and sources of revenue for the central party organizations are not made known, yet this reaches a considerable total each year. The Labor party obtains its funds chiefly from trade unions and co-operatives, and also solicits regular individual subscriptions from the membership. Financing of the Conservatives is more a matter of speculation, although the party of aristocracy and "free enterprise" clearly depends for support upon wealthy landowners, successful financiers, and great industrialists, with or without title. Both the Liberal and Conservative parties have in the past prospered from the ancient practice of granting "honours" to certain individuals on an annual list. Elevation to a peerage is a distinction desperately sought after by many. While such recognition is based upon some kind of public service—military prowess, government service, or public benefactions, for example—the circumstance of being a generous donor to party funds is unquestionably helpful to a commoner with lordly ambition. His personal and public record must be of some consequence, of course, but while honours are no longer sold outright, money is a magnet to which these distinctions often accrue.¹⁴

¹⁴ The sources of central party funds are analyzed frankly in James K. Pollock, *Money and Politics Abroad* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932), Ch. IV. The closest American parallel to the financial side of the honours procedure is found in the relationship between Ambassadorships and contributions to Presidential campaign funds.

Although Members of Parliament are now paid £1,000 annually (something over \$4,000 at current rates of exchange), it is particularly difficult for a candidate with limited funds to secure and hold a seat. The law requires that election expenditures be kept within a limit of sixpence per voter in rural constituencies and fivepence per voter in urban areas but even so, in many places this means the equivalent of close to a year's income from office. The average outlay per candidate reported in the 1945 election was over \$2,500. However, it is also necessary to "nurse the constituency" by making contributions to charities, sponsoring social functions, and appearing in person at appropriate public and private gatherings. This, to be done properly, costs a considerable sum each year. The importance of party programs in British elections has increased, however, to the point where even the best-nursed constituencies held by Conservatives have become fickle and turned to Labor. While Labor candidates are sometimes assisted in meeting their political expenses by local trade unions, it is still true that the money problem accounts in part for the considerable Labor personnel in Parliament coming from the upper classes. This, too, explains some of the mediocrity evident in the membership of all parties in the House. Moneyed men are not always statesmen.

Electoral participation in British elections is high. Although in the 1945 elections 33 million registrations were listed, while 25 million votes were cast, the difference is in part due to multiple listings of individuals on a residence, property, or University basis. When a national election is held, only one or at the most two candidates are to be chosen from a constituency, and this simplification of the voter's problems naturally enhances his interest. The simple little British ballot, with its names of two or three candidates, or at most a half dozen, stands in bright contrast to the vast "blanket" ballots of the United States with scores of candidates listed for offices by the dozen.

Adding to interest in elections is the small size of the constituencies, averaging 75,000 persons, excluding the University lists. This may be compared with the average of over 300,000 persons in Congressional Districts in the United States. Moreover, personal participation in campaigning is encouraged by the law prohibiting payment of workers soliciting votes or providing transportation to the polling places. Not only does this save the candidates a major expense, and eliminate a source of

indirect bribery, but it lifts election service to a higher level of respectability. There is no doubt but that for political integrity and enthusiastic participation in the vote, the British citizen is unexcelled by the electors of any other country.

The figures on participation and expenses in the 1945 Parliamentary elections are shown in the following table.

GENERAL ELECTION OF 1945: VOTING AND EXPENDITURE ¹⁵

	Number of			Total Expenses	Postal Votes	Total Votes
	Electors	Members	Candidates			
England and Wales	28,992,576	553	1,468	\$3,839,432	1,100,248	21,950,098
Scotland	3,406,701	74	189	407,752	201,363	2,422,681
Northern Ireland	841,114	13	26	44,680	12,298	722,416
Total	33,240,391	640	1,683	\$4,291,864	1,313,909	25,095,195

POLITICAL PARTIES

Development of the Party System. One British institution whose mode of origin should be readily appreciated by the American student is the political party. In both countries this democratic element appeared spontaneously, without formal recognition in written law, either statutory or constitutional. James Madison foresaw this in his famous observation: “. . . the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government.” ¹⁶ The economic origins of parties were thus stressed by the Father of the American Constitu-

¹⁵ Figures from *Election Expenses*, H. C., 38th Parl., 1st Sess., No. 128 (1946). Pound sterling converted at \$4.00.

¹⁶ *The Federalist* (New York: Everyman's Library, 1911), No. X.

tion in 1788. Madison recognized, however, that other forces such as religion, and even the mere conflict of personalities, were factors in party life.

Political parties exist because they serve certain important functions in society. The nature of the governmental system determines the number of such organizations, and the responsibilities which they carry. In the U.S.S.R., but one party is permitted, and it is employed chiefly as an agency of Communist domination. The induced unity in Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany was likewise based upon monoparty control. A democratic system, however, permits—indeed, requires—the existence of party rivalry in the promotion of a healthy consideration of alternatives as government attacks the endless succession of problems which confront society.

The contributions rendered by political parties in a democracy are generally recognized to be: (1) Sponsoring a program of public policy; (2) Advancing candidates for office; (3) Conducting campaigns and stimulating electoral participation; (4) Educating the electorate concerning the operations of government and the issues of the day; (5) Providing a basis of organization in legislative bodies; (6) When not in a majority, checking the party in power through vigorous criticism; and (7) Serving as a medium of sympathetic personal contact between the private citizen and the disturbing multiplicity of administrative agencies in the modern Service State.¹⁷

So long as government was absolute and despotic, and while early Parliaments included the members of the ruling estates—the Lords Spiritual and Temporal—the political party could not exist. As soon, however, as the idea of representation appeared, the rudiments of party organization came into being. Only when individuals possess some choice in the selection of leadership can they gravitate into groups to support candidates who have their confidence.

This process began in England in the seventeenth century, as the Commons began to emerge from its secondary role in relation to the Crown. By 1679 the terms Whig and Tory had appeared to designate opposing forces in Parliamentary affairs. This rivalry lasted until the Reform Bill of 1832, after which the

¹⁷ Edmund Burke's classic, though limited, definition of party was: "a body of men united for promoting, by their joint endeavours, the national interest, upon some particular principle, in which they are agreed."

Tories became known more generally as Conservatives, and the Whigs were ultimately merged with the Liberal party. The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the alternation of these two groups in power, their rivalry highlighted by the great political duel between the brilliant Conservative leader Disraeli, and his magnificent Liberal opponent, Gladstone.

The Labor Party had its genesis in the whole working-class movement of the nineteenth century. The principal source of the party's philosophy, however, was the Fabian society, formed in 1884. This group, led by such intellectuals as George Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb, took its name from the Roman general, Fabius Cunctator, who defeated Hannibal by dilatory tactics which would today be termed "attrition." The conservatism of Fabian method is illustrated in the statement of principles of 1896 which read in part, "The Fabian Society is perfectly constitutional in its attitude; and its methods are those usual in political life in England. The Fabian Society begs those who are looking forward to a sensational historical crisis, to join some other society. . . . The Fabian Society does not put Socialism forward as a panacea for the ills of human society, but only for those produced by defective organization of industry and by a radically bad distribution of wealth." This rejection of revolutionary theories was echoed exactly fifty years later at the Labor Party Conference at Bournemouth when, by an overwhelming vote, affiliation with the Communists was blocked through the addition of the following paragraph to the Party constitution: "Political organizations not affiliated to or associated under a national agreement with the party on January 1, 1946, having their own program, principles, and policy for distinctive and separate propaganda . . . or owing allegiance to any political organization situated abroad, shall be ineligible for affiliation to the party."

Other elements in the modern Labor movement in England were contributed by the successor of the Chartists, the Social Democratic Federation, headed by H. M. Hyndman; the Independent Labor Party which appeared in 1893; and the Labor Representative Committee formed in 1900. This brought together representatives of the moderate socialists, the trade unions, and the co-operative societies with the object of securing Parliamentary representation. The Labor Party continues to function on this basis of federation.

The Liberal party has been ground small by the millstones of conservatism and socialism. In 1886, Gladstone attempted to ally the party with the Irish Nationalists by taking a stand for Irish Home Rule. Some Liberals at that time split off on this issue and voted with the Conservatives to defeat the home rule measure. Subsequently this group of Liberal-Unionists continued to vote with the Conservatives. The Liberals and Nationalists also cooperated on most issues, and remained strong among the professional classes and small tradesmen, the rural areas of Wales and Scotland, and among the nonconformists—the religious groups outside the Church of England.

Creation of the Irish Free State removed a major issue and some constituencies from the Liberals. The principal losses of this party have occurred because of its rather vague, middle-of-the-road position, resulting in general defections to the more aggressive Conservative and Labor parties. So long as Labor lacked an effective organization of its own, the working class vote was very largely cast for Liberals. The Labor Representative Committee for some years worked on a basis of endorsing candidates with Liberal affiliation. This practice disappeared with the growing political strength of Labor, aided by the full extension of the franchise.

The Conservative party carries the appeal to tradition, but also stands for moderate, "decent" reform. It is the party of the Anglican Church, of Victorian respectability, of aristocratic lineage and industrial and financial leadership. Back of it is a record of reform, however cautious. Its program of social welfare announced during the war is far from conservative in the classical economic sense, and its strength remains great among the middle classes and in many rural areas. The party program favors the private ownership of enterprise, and maintains the Unionist view of Empire. The Conservative view was given succinctly in the famous remark of Churchill, "I did not become the King's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire!"

England, like the United States, has its generous share of voters committed to a party by virtue of family and community pressures, but there is a strong and growing independent electorate. Thus each party, as in the United States, must avoid straying too far from the main currents of social and economic thought. Today the British Conservatives may be for "free enterprise," but they are also committed to an extensive program of

social security. They challenge Labor's ability to achieve substantial economic advantages from the nationalization of industry, urging that private management will obtain greater production and prosperity than can be achieved through public ownership. On the other hand, Labor is seeking a greater measure of justice in Empire relations, but it is not moving precipitately in the direction of the dismemberment of the world structure of British power. Nor is it likely to.

The British political party is an energetic agency of political education. A constant spur to this activity is the possibility of a sudden Parliamentary crisis precipitating an election. In the United States, national party activity sinks into the doldrums during the off years between Presidential elections. No party dares relax its endeavors in England. A highlight of the British political year is the annual party conference, where the program of the organization is discussed and revised in terms of current conditions. Party study groups, and active political clubs in all the Universities, further the rational and informed approach to public affairs.

The British system has long operated principally on a two-party basis, thus avoiding the instability of governments dependent upon evanescent Parliamentary blocs. One factor contributing to this tendency is the single-member or, at most, double-member constituency. This places a premium on the two-party approach if an absolute majority is to be obtained for a given candidate. Winston Churchill has even contended that the method of seating in the House of Commons, with the Government and the Opposition facing one another from parallel benches on each side of a rectangular chamber, facilitates two-party thinking. More fundamental, of course, is the fact that British tradition has never been rent by atomistic revolution. Issues giving rise to the party system swirled around the Royal prerogative—the King's men and his opponents. Long experience has led the British people to the habit of compromise. The two-party system of English tradition stands not as an expression of class struggle in the Marxian sense, but rather as evidence of practical wisdom and mutuality in the reconciliation of differences.

Modern Party Alignment. Early twentieth century politics were highlighted by the Liberal-Conservative rivalry, with the Liberals under Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith attempting

from 1905 to 1916 to put into effect many social reforms in the face of an overwhelming Conservative majority in the House of Lords. A crisis occurred when the Lords refused to approve the Lloyd George budget of 1909 because of its tax policies. After two elections in rapid succession, the financial veto of the Lords was removed by the Parliament Act of 1911.

World War I saw the foundation of a coalition government directed first by Asquith and, after 1916, by Lloyd George. In 1918 the people went to the polls in the first general election since 1910. The Coalition group sought to continue, and was faced by the Independent Liberals who sought to revive the old Liberal party, and the newly mature Laborites. The Coalition won impressively by 478 seats out of 707, with Labor holding 63, and the Independent Liberals securing only 28.

Postwar economic distress, reminiscent of the period after 1815, and prophetic of the aftermath of World War II, made the position of Lloyd George increasingly difficult. The election of 1922 produced a slight Conservative majority of 36. The next year Prime Minister Baldwin precipitated a crisis on the question of a protective tariff. At this time the Liberal factions joined together in defense of free trade, and Labor won additional strength. The result was the absence of a clear majority for any party, although the Conservatives had a substantial plurality. Inasmuch, however, as the country had not given full approval to Baldwin, the Conservatives gave Labor an opportunity to form a government. The first Labor Prime Minister, Ramsay MacDonald, took office by Conservative and Liberal sufferance, and without sufficient power from his own party, embarked upon a modest program of reform.

The MacDonald government and the Labor party were attacked bitterly on charges of undue sympathy with communism, and the government was finally deserted by sufficient Liberal support to require a new election. The campaign of 1924 was marked by publication of the famous "Zinoviev letter," later proven a forgery, which purported to indicate that the Russian Bolsheviks were urging an immediate communist uprising in Britain. This hurt Labor, and with Stanley Baldwin again taking the post of Prime Minister, the Conservatives returned to power with a comfortable majority. The Liberals lost heavily in this election, and were never able to recover their former position in the party picture.

The election of 1929 brought Labor once more into government leadership, although again without a clear majority. Although Labor this time had the plurality, Prime Minister MacDonald was once again fettered by the strength of the Conservatives and Liberals. He obtained considerable success in revising Empire constitutional relations and in dealing with problems of internal finance. He was plagued increasingly by demands from within the Labor party for a more vigorous policy of socialism. In 1930 he virtually resigned from the Independent Labor Party, which had continued to function as an autonomous element in the federated structure of Labor. In 1931 the I. L. P. in turn seceded from the major party, thus making a reconstituted government necessary.

When MacDonald offered his resignation, he was immediately invited to attempt another coalition ministry, which was set up in 1931. Actually it was primarily a Conservative-Liberal combination, with Labor bitterly hostile to it. Every Labor member who chose to stand with MacDonald was expelled from the Party. The election of 1931, held to subject this new government to electoral review, saw MacDonald and Snowden, former Labor leaders, waging harsh war against their former associates. On the other hand, "traitors" was one of the milder epithets which Labor hurled at the MacDonaldites. The several groups supporting the so-called National Government won the somewhat astonishing total of 554 seats to Labor's 52, and only nine for the Liberals and others. The Conservatives alone had a huge majority with 471 seats. The political situation was such that MacDonald continued as Prime Minister. When he finally resigned and a regular Conservative, Stanley Baldwin, took his place, the elections of 1935 gave the new government a continuing majority. The Conservatives won 387 seats, the National Liberals 33, National Laborites 8, and Independents 3, for a total for the coalition of 431. Labor's strength increased to 154, the non-coalition Liberals received 21 places, and other groups obtained nine, giving the opposition a total of 184. The party picture was not as fractional as this might suggest, however, for the bulk of the popular vote was divided between Conservative and Labor candidates.

The Baldwin ministry was succeeded by that of Neville Chamberlain in 1937, and the next year saw the appearance of "appeasement," culminating in war. The uninspiring leadership of

Chamberlain and the early reverses of the war led in 1940 to the accession of Churchill and the formation of a cabinet which for the first time could be designated accurately as National.

Despite the legal provision that general elections shall be held at least every five years, the war made it necessary to postpone the poll of 1940. Not until July, 1945, when the war in Europe was won, did the people have an opportunity to renew the popular basis of their government. This time the Labor party social program, plus the Conservative failures in foreign policy in the prewar period, resulted in the first effective Labor government in British history. Labor's Clement Attlee became Prime Minister with 393 party followers in the House, as against 197 Conservatives and only 11 Liberals, while other groups had a scattered 39. Labor received 11,967,985 popular votes, the Conservatives 9,087,238, and the Liberals 2,227,400. The smallest vote was the 102,780 given the Communists.

THE BRITISH EXECUTIVE

The King. While the political authority exercised by the British monarch has waned, his symbolic importance has become magnified with the growth of Empire. Henry VIII contracted six marriages, broke with the Church, and confiscated the monastic estates, despite the fact that it was in his reign that the proud phrase "Defender of the Faith" was added to his title. Four hundred years later, Edward VIII was forced to abdicate the throne in order to marry "the woman I love."

The circumstances surrounding Edward's action in 1936 reveal very much about the present role of the King. The people were not consulted. Their sentiments as to the propriety of the proposed liaison were taken for granted. There was no outward indication of pressure being brought to bear upon His Majesty. Yet the subtle institutional forces speaking through the Prime Minister, the Church, and based upon the genteel tradition of Victoria, Edward VII, and George V, were irresistible. Painful though it might be for all concerned, the King who chose to wed a previously married commoner must go. In his place came the Duke of York as George VI, a solid family man, quietly sincere, and impeccably colorless.

Much has been said of the substantive importance of the King's

role as titular Head of State, yet the point is not easily made. Americans are noted for their lack of sympathetic imagination in approaching the emotional attachments of other peoples to their particular symbols and institutions. Moreover, the tradition of '76 includes Tom Paine's view that "Government by kings . . . was the most prosperous invention the Devil ever set on foot for the promotion of idolatry," and again, "Of more worth is one honest man to society than all the crowned ruffians that ever lived." This should not be allowed to stand in the way of recognizing the tremendous influence of the Monarchy in the British Constitutional system. Whether delivering the Speech from the Throne on the opening of a session of Parliament, or reviewing his troops, or presiding at a social function, the King is the personification of sovereignty. He is not only Head of State, but also Governor of the Church of England and head of the Church of Scotland.¹⁸ He is Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces, and he is the aristocratic leader of British society.

It is a matter of very practical usefulness to have the formal center of national authority vested in a source apart from the immediate strife of Parliamentary debate and the commotion of general elections. The obligation of loyalty to the King is a substantial restraint on violence and extremism in political matters, and adds weight to the pronouncements of the Courts.

A Constitutional obscurity is the relationship of the King and the Crown. This may conveniently be cleared up by thinking of the Crown as the complete executive power of the government, including the Prime Minister and Cabinet as the policy-determining elements, and the King as the ceremonial factor. The Crown is thus something of a legal fiction comparable to the concept of a business corporation functioning as a "person." The Crown continues, regardless of the personalities who happen to serve as Monarchs or Ministers. The Crown issues military commissions and makes other executive appointments. The Crown administers the colonies and conducts foreign relations. The Crown, in short, is the formal term for the legal authority of the State.

The King's active political functions are but two. He appoints the Prime Minister. Here he has some slight discretion in the event that leadership in the House of Commons is not settled.

¹⁸ By the Act of Settlement of 1701, which regulates succession to the throne, Roman Catholics are specifically disqualified from this office.

The Labor party elects its head annually, so the King is not in doubt as to the choice called for when this party controls the House. Only in the unusual circumstance of confusion among the members of other parties, or in the event of another election in which no party achieved an absolute majority of seats, would the appointment be based upon some positive element of choice. The other service rendered by the Monarch is to advise the Prime Minister whenever that seems appropriate during consultation. The Prime Minister regularly informs the King of affairs of State, and on certain occasions an expression of the Royal viewpoint may well prove influential, although in no case can it be decisive.

The Prime Minister. In the two centuries since Walpole obtained ministerial leadership, the office has rather steadily increased in responsibility and in authority. Britain has no separation of powers to permit legislative and executive branches to spar inconclusively on matters of policy. The Prime Minister is chief lawmaker and chief executive. If the nation's voters give the go ahead sign to the Labor program, they expect it to be put into operation reasonably soon and with no nonsense from the minority. There is thus an expeditious element in British policy which is lacking in the American Presidential system.

Men rise to party leadership in Great Britain on a basis rather different from that of the United States. The process depends upon effective participation in Parliamentary life, and further demonstration of capacity in some ministerial position. The vote-getting qualities need not be impressive, for party far outweighs personality in British elections. Thus each Prime Minister takes office well grounded in both the legislative and administrative phases of his duties. His achievements may not be brilliant, but he will perform in a workmanlike manner. Once in office he has power based not only upon the electoral mandate, but he can exercise discipline by the judicious awarding or withholding of ministerial appointments. Administrative preferment is his to give or deny as he sees fit. The party whip works closely with the Prime Minister in these matters, and, among other things, is chiefly responsible for making recommendations to the annual honours list. An ultimate source of power comes from the threat of dissolution. If the party members do not stand solidly behind their leader, he may ask the King to dissolve the Parliament and call for an election. The expense and uncertainty involved makes

this prospect most distasteful to the rank and file, so this ultimate weapon in the hands of the Prime Minister is a very great one.

The Prime Minister is now always a member of the House of Commons, and customarily is designated as Leader. To relieve himself of undue Parliamentary responsibilities, Clement Attlee delegated the position of Leader in the House of Commons to one of his Cabinet associates, Herbert Morrison. At one time there was no salary attached to the Prime Minister's office, and it was necessary for him to carry some other ministerial portfolio in order to qualify for income. Today the office is paid £10,000 annually. From the regime of Walpole the quarters at No. 10 Downing Street have been provided as the Prime Minister's official residence.

The Cabinet. The heart of the working government in Britain is the Cabinet. It is a body of varying size, composed of Ministers designated by the Prime Minister to serve in this capacity. Before the recent war, the Cabinet contained from 20 to 22 members, but during the course of hostilities a small War Cabinet of nine was formed under Chamberlain, and this was later reduced to five by Churchill, and then increased to eight. The postwar Cabinet set up by Clement Attlee contained the following:

- Prime Minister
- First Lord of the Treasury
- Minister of Defense
- Lord President of the Council
- Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
- Lord Privy Seal
- Chancellor of the Exchequer
- President of the Board of Trade
- Lord Chancellor
- First Lord of the Admiralty
- Secretary of State for the Home Department
- Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs
- Secretary of State for India
- Secretary of State for Burma
- Secretary of State for the Colonies
- Secretary of State for War
- Secretary of State for Air
- Secretary of State for Scotland
- Minister of Labor and National Service

Minister of Fuel and Power
Minister of Education -
Minister of Health
Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries

Since the Prime Minister also occupied the posts of First Lord of the Treasury and Minister of Defense, while Lord Pethick-Lawrence was the head of the Burma Office and the India Office as well, these 23 ministerial responsibilities were carried by 20 individuals. While some members of the Cabinet come from the House of Lords, this group is kept small. Since only Ministers who sit in the House of Commons can appear there to discuss their work, it is desirable that as many department heads as possible be drawn from the lower chamber. An individual may on occasion be assigned a Ministry without belonging to Parliament, but he must obtain a place in Commons reasonably soon if he is to continue with the appointment.

The functions of most Cabinet officers are suggested by their titles. A few, however, require explanation. The Lord President of the Council has no departmental duties, but is head of the Privy Council. As will be seen, this is not an arduous duty so, as with the Lord Privy Seal, this officer is available for a variety of special services to the Prime Minister. The Lord Chancellor is the presiding officer of the House of Lords, and the chief law officer of the realm. The Home Secretary has no counterpart in the American system. His office is a kind of historical repository and general catch-all for domestic affairs. It is in charge of the police system of London, and supervises the police elsewhere in the United Kingdom, except in Scotland. It enforces factory acts and other comparable regulations; supervises prisons; controls elections; administers the naturalization laws; and performs numerous other related and even unrelated tasks. The Board of Trade no longer meets as a Board. It compiles statistics on industrial matters, maintains a register of British ships, maintains light-houses and harbors, regulates patents and trademarks, supervises joint-stock companies and administers bankruptcy law, establishes standards of weights and measures, and grants provisional orders authorizing boroughs to own or operate public utilities.

Increasingly the Cabinet operates through committees, instead of sitting as a body. Decisions made in committee and meeting with the approval of the Prime Minister may become the basis of

administrative regulations, or may become a government-sponsored bill in Parliament, where its passage is a virtual certainty.

The Privy Council. Each member of the Cabinet becomes a member of the Privy Council, and in addition others prominent in public life receive this distinction, the total reaching something close to 500. It is the descendant of the *Curia Regis*, the King's advisory council which antedated Parliament and in Norman days dealt with all matters of legislation and administration. In the fifteenth century it became the *Concilium Privatum* under Henry VI. After a long period of conflict, Parliamentary supremacy in legislative matters was established. Various functions formerly conducted by committees of the Privy Council have been taken over by government departments such as the Board of Trade. Today one of the few remaining functions of this body, although an important one, is to give formal and legal authority to the numerous executive ordinances which implement the general policies enacted by Parliament. As the Crown has operated through the centuries, it can act validly only through the Privy Council. Consequently, the Cabinet members decide upon administrative policy as political colleagues of the Prime Minister, but it is as Privy Councillors that they provide the formal authorization of the Crown for their determinations. The more important rules made by the several Ministers are reviewed by a small group of Privy Councillors—generally the Minister affected and three or four others interested in the matter. This committee, if it approves the final form of the measure, issues an Order in Council in the presence of the King. This gives to administrative legislation some of the publicity and concern for draftsmanship which is invaluable to a public faced with the expanding jurisdiction of the British bureaucracy.¹⁹ Aside from ceremonial occasions of State, the Council does not meet as a body. When the British Cabinet meets, it is in effect an informal committee of the Privy Council.

The Ministry. There are a number of additional ministerial posts which are rarely or never included in the Cabinet. These, however, are part of the government, and are included in the list of officers who collectively are responsible to the Commons, and

¹⁹ The problems of the legislative powers of the departments are fully analyzed in C. T. Carr: *Delegated Legislation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921). See also John Willis: *The Parliamentary Powers of English Government Departments* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933).

whose resignations will follow the fall of a Prime Minister. The entire Ministry, not just the Cabinet, formulates and applies administrative policy for the country.

The non-Cabinet ministries include several which arose in relation to the war: Aircraft Production, War Transport, Food, and Information. Also represented are the older departments: Post Office, Board of Trade, Overseas Trade, Pensions, Works, and the Law Officers' Department headed by the Attorney-General. Fiscal interests are represented by such departments as Inland Revenue, Customs and Excise, the Paymaster-General's Office, and the Ministry of National Insurance. Others are the Ministry of Civil Aviation, Ministry of Town and Country Planning, and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Political leadership in the departments includes, in addition to the Ministers or Secretaries, assistants carrying such titles as Under-Secretaries, Parliamentary Secretaries, Financial Secretaries, Junior Lords of the Treasury, and Assistant Postmaster-General. The Permanent Under-Secretary, however, is a person of great importance and distinction. A member of the permanent staff of civil servants, this officer supervises the routine work of his department with a background of long service in administration. The Permanent Under-Secretaries form the top hierarchy in the British career service. They are indispensable to the smooth operation of the bureaucracy, especially during the periods when one government replaces another.

Other Administrative Agencies. In addition to the departments of ministerial status, the manifold activities of the central government are conducted through numerous units less intimately represented in Parliament. Some are spoken for by Members who are not part of the Ministry. Others are subject to budgetary control through one or another of the Ministers. Still others are independent organizations placed in charge of certain public enterprises, such as the Central Electricity Board, the Port of London Authority, and the British Broadcasting Corporation.²⁰

Both ministerial and non-ministerial administrative structure

²⁰ British methods of public ownership and control are reviewed in W. A. Robson (Ed.), *Public Enterprise* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937); Lincoln Gordon, *The Public Corporation in Great Britain* (London: Oxford University Press, 1938); and T. O'Brien, *British Experiments in Public Ownership and Control* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935).

will grow more complex as Britain ventures farther into the field of public enterprise. It is already evident that problems of co-ordination are increasing. Overlapping jurisdiction, conflicting policy, competitive bureaucratic aggrandizement, confusion of function, and multiplicity of administrative orders present challenges which cannot readily be met by the large Cabinet and still more cumbersome Ministry.²¹ Economic ingenuity must be accompanied by administrative statesmanship if the government's program is to succeed. Political engineering is as necessary as social engineering in the Britain of today.

The Civil Service. So long as Parliament was the center of political favoritism and corruption in England, standards of public service among the lesser employees of the government were low. With the correction of many abuses through the reforms of 1832 and 1867, serious attention came to be given to the improvement of the quality of the Civil Service. During the first half of the nineteenth century, the principle of merit in the recruitment of personnel developed in the India service. This helped to spur the demand for the application of similar policies in the other departments. A three-man Civil Service Commission with limited jurisdiction was set up in 1855. Its powers were slowly extended until in 1870 an Order in Council provided for open competitive examinations throughout the service.

The Civil Service today operates under Treasury authority, supplemented by the work of the independent Civil Service Commission, which serves as the examining agency in recruitment and promotion. The three Commissioners are appointed by the Crown—meaning, of course, the Cabinet—but for a specified term, which gives them considerable political immunity. When a vacancy occurs, the Treasury is consulted before a new Commissioner is appointed. All other features of Civil Service policy are conducted by the Treasury, whose Permanent Secretary is also the official Head of the Civil Service. This places fiscal and personnel control together in an effective manner.

In prewar Britain there were some 450,000 civilian employees of the State. Most of these were in the Post Office (which includes the publicly owned telegraph and telephone services), or served as industrial workers in shipyards and arsenals, or in various un-

²¹ These and related problems are reviewed in the leading work on the British Cabinet system, W. I. Jennings: *Cabinet Government* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936).

skilled activities as messengers, porters, and cleaners. The post-war Civil Service is larger, and will remain so. In 1946 there were 700,000 civil employees, with the Post Office accounting for close to a quarter-million, while the Ministry of Food employed 49,000, Labor 41,000, Works 19,000, and the Board of Trade 15,000. The unifying and directive group at the head of this mass of public servants is the relatively small Administrative Division of about 2,000, from which the Permanent Secretaries, Second Secretaries, and other departmental supervisors are drawn.

The Administrative Division is recruited in part from subordinate divisions and classes by promotion of individuals who possess unusual ability. Over three-fourths of the group, however, are drawn directly into the Administrative Classes by competitive examinations so designed that ordinarily only honor graduates of Universities are successful. This practice of testing the general, rather than the specific knowledge of Administrative candidates is an outstanding characteristic of the British Civil Service. It attracts to this area of public leadership a group of men who possess broad knowledge, quick intelligence, and proven qualities of application. What they lack in the way of detailed knowledge of administrative techniques will be acquired as they move up the ladder of service.

This procedure may be contrasted with that traditional in the United States, where emphasis in recruitment at all levels is placed upon qualification for the immediate vacancy, rather than upon capacity for ultimate supervision and direction. This means that in many lines of public service, administrative leadership is ultimately entrusted to individuals who have risen on the basis of seniority and more or less ordinary performance of routine duty.²² In recent years the United States has attracted University graduates to the Federal Service on a basis somewhat like that of Great Britain, through so-called Junior Professional Assistants. However this has not become a standard basis for recruiting the ultimate administrative leadership in Washington. Nor can such a procedure be fully developed until the Executive De-

²² A considerable number of administrative services in the United States, particularly on the State and local government levels, are without merit systems. See Marshall E. Dimock and Gladys O. Dimock, *American Government in Action* (New York: Rinehart & Company, 1946), Ch. 39, "Administration as a Career," and John M. Pfiffner, *Public Administration* (New York: The Ronald Press Co., Rev. Ed., 1946), Ch. 2, "The Study of Public Administration."

partments are staffed by officers equivalent to the Permanent Secretaries of the British system.

Opposition to placing the direction of administration in the hands of a "class" of individuals of superior educational attainments would, of course, be widespread in the United States. There is still a considerable residue of the Jacksonian idea that "any man is good enough to hold any job in the government." Moreover, the British type of examination for the Administrative Classes is subject to attack for its emphasis upon the classical subjects stressed in higher education in England. Americans want tests to be of a "practical" rather than a "theoretical" nature.

To this sort of argument John Stuart Mill provided a reply as long ago as 1859. Such tests, he pointed out, are to determine the extent of a candidate's education, on the premise that there is a relationship between attainment in this field and ultimate capacity for intelligent group direction. He rightly saw that the detractors of the growing British practice were mostly opposed to the fundamental principle of selection by merit. "Nothing will satisfy the objectors," Mill wryly commented, "but free admission of total ignorance."²³

The entire system of public service in Great Britain is based upon the principles of merit recruitment; classification of positions to provide, so far as possible, "equal pay for equal work"; specific salary brackets with regular increments; tenure of office subject to good behavior; promotion within the service, with reasonable recognition of seniority; vacations and sick leave; and ultimate retirement on pension at specified age limits. Emphasis upon impartial service to the public is implicit in the prohibitions against civil employees serving as candidates for Parliament, or engaging in other types of partisan political activities; trade union membership must be confined to organizations open exclusively to public employees, and not affiliated with any political party. Such regulations are not alone the explanation of the high degree of integrity in the British service, but they underscore the professional obligations of the servant of the State. A high standard of nonpartisan and competent performance extends through the ranks to the Permanent Secretaries. While there are

²³ J. S. Mill, *Utilitarianism and Representative Government* (New York: Everyman's Library, 1910), p. 344. The Administrative Classes have been analyzed in H. E. Dale, *The Higher Civil Service of Great Britain* (London: Oxford University Press, 1941).

always certain potential dangers in a bureaucracy, Britain moves into the era of socialism fortified by possession of a Civil Service which is essentially democratic and dependable.²⁴

PARLIAMENT

Genesis of the Legislature. In origin the British Parliament goes back to the Witan, or advisory council of "wise men" customarily appointed by each Saxon King. These Witenagemots were constituted functionally; that is, they included the chief dignitaries of the realm, who held office at the King's pleasure. They were not, it is now generally agreed, representative bodies in the modern sense. The Great Councils of the Norman rulers were similarly gatherings in which the feudal lords participated by virtue of their high estate. In time, the King's Council and its inner group, the *Curia Regis* or King's Court, obtained some powers of restraint over the Monarch, but had no positive authority in matters of policy.

In the thirteenth century, the growing fiscal needs of the King made it necessary to expand the tax potential of the Great Council. Some element of representation had already appeared since the monastic orders represented in the Council had their own methods of selecting leaders.²⁵ Political representation, however, began with the inclusion in the Council of knights and burgesses chosen to act for the larger number of such personages in the counties and towns. This came to full flower when these representatives were chosen by their own groups, instead of by appointment through agents of the King.

The term Parliament was used in 1265 when an assembly was called by Simon de Montfort, leader of the barons who had defeated Henry III. At this tax-voting body, selected burgesses from the leading towns were in attendance. Participation by commoners in following Parliaments was intermittent, but the practice was fully established in the gathering convoked by Edward I in 1295. Since this laid the pattern for all subsequent legislative

²⁴ Full surveys of the system are Herman Finer, *The British Civil Service* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1927), and W. A. Robson (Ed.), *The British Civil Servant* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937).

²⁵ "The church originated representative institutions; the state adopted them." Henry J. Ford, *Representative Government* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1924), p. 111. On the genesis of representation, see especially chapters IX, X.

organization, it is referred to as the Model Parliament. Representatives of the towns were elected, and at the same time the precedent was set for the meeting of Lords and Commons in separate groups.

The House of Lords. In Gilbert and Sullivan's pleasant musical satire, *Iolanthe*, the following verse is sung in tribute to the work of the upper house of Parliament:

When Wellington thrash'd Bonaparte,
As ev'ry child can tell,
The House of Peers throughout the war,
Did nothing in particular,
And did it very well:
Yet Britain set the world ablaze
In good King George's glorious days!

This was somewhat unkind to the chamber with antecedents which go back to a period long before any participation in government by commoners. But it indicates the low political estate to which the mighty had fallen, even in the nineteenth century.

At one time the Spiritual Lords were in the ascendancy in the upper House, and outnumbered the secular Peers. As late as the Reformation Parliament of 1529 there were 48 ecclesiastical Lords and 44 Lords Temporal. Henry VIII reduced religious representation, and today the House of Lords has become overwhelmingly a secular body, with 24 Bishops and the two Archbishops of the Church of England included in a membership which totals about 800. The Temporal Lords include the following groups: (1) Peers of the Royal Blood, who never attend, since the Royal Family scrupulously avoids politics; (2) various classes of hereditary Peers, totaling about 700; (3) 16 representative Peers of Scotland, elected for each Parliament from the 37 Scottish Peers; (4) 11 representative Peers of Ireland, serving for life; and (5) seven Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, commonly termed the Law Lords, who also serve for life.²⁸

The possible voting membership of the House of Lords is not known precisely, but this is not important. Usually the attend-

²⁸ Originally there were 28 Irish representative Peers. Creation of the Irish Free State ended the provisions for electing new Irish representatives, so this group is gradually disappearing from the House of Lords. Irish and Scottish Peers come of titles in existence before the Act of Union with Scotland in 1701, and the Act of Union with Ireland in 1800. The great bulk of Peerages were created since those dates, and are all now given as Peerages of the United Kingdom.

ance is a hundred or less, and only three need be present to constitute a quorum. The presiding officer is the Lord Chancellor, the leading judicial officer of the Kingdom. Procedure is rather informal. The Chancellor presides sitting on a large couch known as the Woolsack, which reputedly was first used in Elizabethan days to remind their Lordships of the importance of the wool trade. As a chairman, the Chancellor has little power, not even that of recognition. Differences over precedence in debate are settled by the vote of the entire House.

The Lords have steadily declined in political power. Two great crises, in 1832 and 1911, determined their secondary role in Parliament. Primacy of the Commons became apparent when in 1832 the Whig Premier, Earl Grey, obtained the sanction of the King to create sufficient new Peerages to pass the Reform Bill which had been rejected by the Lords the previous year. The upper House retreated from this threat, and the bill passed, but this weapon successfully employed by Grey remained in the arsenal of future Prime Ministers. It was brought out again, with much more effect, in 1911. The Lords had rejected the budget of the Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, David Lloyd George, in 1909, on the grounds that its provisions for taxing unearned increment were unfair to property owners. A general election had returned the Liberals to the Commons with a majority, indicating that the electorate was back of them in the dispute. The Parliament Act was then introduced, passed in the Commons, and accepted by the Lords who again were threatened with the creation of hundreds of new Peerages if the bill could not otherwise be enacted.

The Parliament Act had two main provisions. First, a money bill—any measure dealing exclusively with taxation, or the appropriation and payment of public funds—cannot be rejected by the Lords if it is sent to them a month or more before the end of a session. Second, any bill passed by the Commons in three sessions, with an interval of at least two years between second reading of the bill the first time, and final passage in the third session, will become law even though the Lords remain in opposition. Thus no bill can be held up by the Lords for more than two years; even a measure calling for their elimination as a branch of Parliament. Only two bills have been passed by resorting to this second procedure, and both of those were in the years just prior to World War I. From 1914 to 1945 the Lords had no par-

ticular occasion to resort to the dilatory tactics left to them. Two wars placed emphasis upon unity, and in the interim the Commons was dominated by the Conservatives. The nationalization program of Labor, however, places the Lords in the more difficult position of being called upon to vote for measures the substance of which they may not approve. Conscious of the mood of the nation, it is extremely unlikely that their Lordships will interpose any serious barrier to legislation approved in Commons.

The Lords continue to render certain useful and even important, legislative and judicial service. There are three chief aspects to the work of the House as a legislative body. First, it is a forum for general discussion of questions of great public consequence. A member, by "moving for papers," opens such a policy debate. The addresses which follow are not political harangues. The Lords have no constituents who may turn them out at the next election. But the Peers ²⁷—the politically active ones in particular—are men of proven capacity in such varied fields as foreign service and colonial administration, military and judicial life, and business and finance. They possess a cautious viewpoint, as indicated by the listing of 460 as Conservatives, as against 34 Labor Peers, 63 Liberals, and the rest with minor affiliation or no recorded preference. Yet their collective knowledge and ability cannot but give weight to their position on matters of policy.

A second function of the Lords in legislative affairs is direct participation in lawmaking. They are able to improve the details of bills passed in Commons, and they inaugurate measures of their own, though mostly of a local and private bill type. Finally, the Lords carry a considerable share of the time-consuming committee work associated with these local and private measures.

The judicial work of the Lords is of an appellate nature. The right to hear impeachments is no longer significant, with the rise of collectively responsible Cabinets. The power to try fellow-Peers in major legal matters is also of no modern importance. However, the Lord Chancellor and the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, together with any other Peers who have held, or still occupy, high judicial posts, sit as the highest court in certain civil and

²⁷ When Lord Newton moved for a reduction of the size of the House of Lords in 1923, he gave interesting figures on attendance. In 1920, of 664 Temporal Peers, 195 did not attend at all, and 180 appeared less than ten times; in 1921, of 674 Temporal Lords, 240 were never present, and 220 came less than ten times; and in 1922, with a total of 684 Temporal Peers, 189 were entirely absent, with 222 present under ten times. See 53 *House of Lords Deb.*, 5th Ser., 536.

criminal cases. On civil appeals, permission of the Court of Appeal or of the House of Lords itself is required. In criminal appeals, jurisdiction is limited to capital cases, and only to those certified by the Attorney-General as involving a point of law of "exceptional public importance," the decision of which is required in the public interest.

Revision, or "reform," of the House of Lords has been the subject of numerous studies and recommendations. In general, these propose a reduction of the membership of the House and its conversion to a more wieldy second chamber. These proposals have not gone beyond discussion however, for it is no simple task to reorganize according to rational plan an institution which evolved slowly through centuries of Constitutional adaptation. To strengthen the upper House, for instance, would inevitably give it greater power in relation to the Commons, and there appears to be general satisfaction with the present primacy of the lower House. The Labor party has long been committed in its platform to the abolition of the House of Lords, but this has not been advanced as a major necessity, and there is no prospect of precipitate action in this direction. In the Introduction to the second edition of his *English Constitution*, Bagehot predicted, "If the House of Peers ever goes, it will go in a storm, and the storm will not leave all else as it is." Such a tempest does not loom on the political horizon. It may be that the fate of the Lords will be held in abeyance for a time in accordance with that other verse from *Iolanthe*:

While the House of Peers withholds
Its legislative hand,
And noble statesmen do not itch
To interfere with matters which
They do not understand,
As bright will shine Great Britain's rays,
As in King George's glorious days!

The House of Commons. Although the House of Commons is committed to a nominal membership of 615, the number was increased to 640 for the 1945 election by division of certain borough constituencies exceeding 100,000 population. Permanent boundaries commissions will ultimately adjust the lines to bring the number reasonably close to the 615 figure. Most constituencies elect but one member, although for historical reasons

two members are allotted to a district such as the City of London. Election on a simple plurality basis works obvious inequities in districts where three or more parties wage strong contests. Thus in 1945 the Liberals won 9 per cent of the total vote, and only 1.7 per cent of the seats in Commons. The Liberal Nationals won more seats, yet polled fewer votes. Figures such as these raise the question of adoption of a system of proportional representation in Parliamentary elections comparable to that used in France and other Continental nations.

Sentiment in favor of this system of representation has been strong among various parties in England from time to time, but it rouses little enthusiasm on the part of any party which happens to be in power, for it would generally tend to reduce the Government's working majority. For example, Labor polled less than 12 million votes in 1945 out of a total of close to 25 million. A system of proportional representation would have given Labor at best a very slim margin of leadership, instead of the heavy majority of 146 votes with which it began its term of control. The two-party tradition in Britain is a powerful resistant to demands for more precise mathematical representation of fractional party groups.

The activity of the lower House of the British legislature proceeds upon a basis of strong party compulsion. However, the Speaker serves in a nonpartisan capacity. Although chosen, when a vacancy exists, from the party currently in power, this is only done after consultation with the Opposition, resulting in election by acclamation. Subsequently the Speaker is regarded as above party considerations, is usually reelected from his constituency without opposition, and serves through such changes of Ministry as may occur in his term of service. Thus a new Speaker was chosen by the Conservatives in 1943, and he was continued in office by the Labor government formed in 1945.

As with many other aspects of the British system, the role of the Speaker is based largely on unwritten custom, as well as on such formal provisions as are included in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. He seeks to give reasonable opportunity for participation in debate to speakers from both Government and Opposition benches, yet at the same time it is his duty to prevent the minority from becoming merely obstructionist in its tactics. Parliamentary procedure often becomes highly involved, calling

for great skill on the part of the Speaker in controlling the situation.

Among the restrictions policed by the Speaker is one prohibiting members from speaking twice on a question, except in committee. Reading from a manuscript is barred. Anyone who becomes repetitious, or who strays from the subject, may be called to the point, or, after three warnings, may have his remarks terminated. When the Speaker rises, the member sits. The Speaker may refuse to entertain a motion he regards as dilatory. To exercise these and a host of other responsibilities fairly and in good taste is the difficult task of the presiding officer, but essential to the proper functioning of the House.

Debate is terminated in one of three ways. On uncomplicated matters, simple closure may be applied. A motion "that the question be now put" may be submitted, unless the Speaker believes it infringes on the rights of the Opposition. This requires a vote, and if the motion is carried—provided at least 100 members support it—the discussion ends. A second method is by advance agreement to place definite time limits on consideration of a bill, or sections thereof. When this is in effect, a final vote is taken regardless of the state of controversy, the sudden conclusion of remarks giving this device the name "guillotine closure." Finally, the Speaker, or the chairman of committees, may occasionally be empowered to select from among a number of proposed amendments those he regards as of real import. This power to jump from one amendment to another for discussion is called "kangaroo closure."

When votes are taken, the Speaker's interpretation of the oral ayes and noes is generally decisive. If there is challenge, it will lead to a formal poll, or division. Then the cry "division" goes up, and bells ring throughout the building, giving all members in the vicinity warning of what is impending. Voting proceeds by members marching out into the "division lobbies," the ayes on one side, the noes on another. They are recorded by tellers appointed by the chair, and the members return to their places by another door. The tellers are able to report the results to the chair in about fifteen minutes, as against the forty-five minutes usually required for a roll-call in the House of Representatives of the United States.

On divisions of importance, where the Government interprets the vote as raising the issue of confidence, the Whips are "put

on," and the members are subject to very considerable pressure to vote with their party.²⁸ While some independence of viewpoint may be expressed by members during debate, they vote against their party, or even abstain from voting, at their political peril. One important influence here is the primacy of the party program in British elections. A member is not required by law or by custom to live in the constituency he represents. He is elected primarily because of the party program he espouses, with his personal qualifications of secondary though not inconsequential importance. Moreover, if he aspires to a position in the Ministry, he must be a good party man. Finally, if his behavior contributes to the fall of a Government, he will in all probability have to answer to his constituency in an ensuing, and expensive, election. The premium on party regularity is thus very great.

Procedure is expedited by constant conferences among the Whips of the several parties. Although in very real political conflict with one another, they recognize the mutual advantage of agreement concerning the order in which various measures are to be considered, and the limitations to be imposed on debate. British recognition of the minority as an integral part of democratic rule is epitomized by the inclusion in the Commons budget of a special salary grant to the Leader of His Majesty's Opposition.

The Enactment of Law. Bills are of two kinds, public and private. Public bills are those of wide general application, whereas private bills are specific and local in their effect, and include such measures as those permitting a given municipal corporation to engage in some activity not authorized in its charter. Public bills, in turn, are divided into two groups: government bills, and private members' bills. Government bills are all public measures sponsored by the government of the day, including any proposal having to do with finance. Private members' bills are public bills proposed by members of the House who are not in the Ministry. The major legislative work of the House, then, consists of passing government bills. Each of these is backed by the Cabinet, and is introduced and supported chiefly by one or another of the Ministers.

²⁸ Government Whips under Prime Minister Attlee: Parliamentary Secretary of the Treasury and the five Junior Lords of the Treasury, together with the Treasurer of the Household, Comptroller of the Household, and Vice-Chamberlain of the Household.

Private members have little opportunity to advance their own measures. During the first part of an ordinary session some time is set aside on Fridays for this type of legislation. So many desire this privilege that they draw lots to see who will have a chance to be heard. Even so, if a member presents a bill opposed by the government, it will fail. On the other hand, if the government likes the private member's idea, sponsorship will probably be taken over by an appropriate Minister and it will go through as a government bill. So a private member's bill as such passes only when the government is indifferent to it. In the closing weeks of a session there is no time set aside for such measures, and during the war this privilege was completely suspended throughout a session.

The subordinate role of the private members in authoring legislation lends emphasis to the way in which bills are screened at the source. This avoids the practice of the American Congress, where a host of bills appear in each session, many of them having no chance of passing. In England, government bills are introduced only after careful advance consideration, and there is a strong intention that each such proposal shall pass. The government in Parliament is either in the saddle, or it is unhorsed. There is no middle ground as in the United States, where a party may have a paper majority but be unable to secure adoption of its principal legislative measures because of defection from the ranks.

According to traditional Parliamentary practice, a bill must be "read" three times before final passage. Bills are not actually read in their entirety at any time, however, for printed copies are in the hands of the members during debate. Passage of a public bill in Commons is in five stages: (1) First Reading, at which time only the title is read; (2) Second Reading, when the general principles of the bill are discussed and voted upon; (3) Committee Stage, providing opportunity for specific amendments and deletions to polish up the measure already approved in substance; (4) Report Stage, in which the House is informed of the decisions taken in committee, and (5) Third Reading, involving another general discussion of the merits of the bill, concluding with a vote on final passage. After a bill goes through comparable steps in the Lords, it is accepted by the King, who signs all public non-financial bills with the old Norman phrase, "*Le Roi le veult.*"

It should be noted that, unlike the procedure in American legislative bodies, the committee stage of lawmaking occurs only after the bill has received the general approval of the House. This saves a great deal of time for all the members. American practice, wherein bills are referred to committee immediately following introduction, means that legislators frequently devote much time to perfecting legislation only to have the bill rejected or die on a calendar at the end of a session.

In Commons, debate on second reading may reveal sufficient objection to a bill to cause the government to withdraw it. But the nature of the Opposition's criticism is made apparent at this time, suggesting certain improvements to be made in the committee stage in an effort to gain more general support on third reading. For a long time the committee stage meant simply procedure in Committee of the Whole House. When the House sits as a committee of the whole, the Speaker leaves the chair, his symbol of royal authority, the Mace, is removed, and some other member presides. Members may speak more than once, there is no arbitrary closure, and in general an informal atmosphere of discussion prevails as details are perfected.

In the present century the House has relied more regularly on the work of five great Standing Committees, of from 30 to 50 members each. Four of these are designated by letters: A, B, C, D; and the fifth is the Committee on Scottish Affairs. Aside from measures affecting Scotland, bills on any subject may be sent to one or another of the Standing Committees. As much as possible the intent is to have each committee view a bill as it would be regarded in the Committee of the Whole House. There is a specific desire to avoid the kind of legislative specialization associated with the Standing Committee system of the American Congress, where committees are assigned bills according to the subject matter of each proposal. In Parliament a bill may occasionally be submitted to a Select Committee, set up especially to consider some aspect of the measure, but after this it will still go to one of the larger committees. Most Select Committees are dissolved as soon as they report, but a few are set up for an entire session, and are thus termed Sessional Committees.

Private and local legislation is dealt with on a different plan. Small committees of four members are created to consider groups of these bills. Proponents and opponents are heard, and the recommendation of the committee is generally accepted by the

House. This type of legislation may be initiated in both the Commons and Lords, and while each bill must go through the same general stages as public bills, the committee stage becomes most important and there is little debate on the floor of either House in connection with most private legislation. Much time is taken up, however, in the quasi-judicial hearings conducted by the private bill committees, and it is here that the Lords carry a considerable share of work that might otherwise fall exclusively on the shoulders of the members of the lower House.

Woven through this pattern of practical procedure is a great deal of colorful ceremony. One instance of this is the Speech from the Throne which is read early in a new session of Parliament, usually by the King in person. This ritual is made piquant by the fact that the address is prepared by the government and actually expresses the proposed policies of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, rather than the personal views of the Monarch. An address in reply is then submitted from each House, generally precipitating a lengthy debate during which the program of each party is expounded. Again, sessions during the week begin at 2:45 and end around 11:30. At adjournment the attendants raise the cry "Who goes home?" a call harking back to the days of the Tudors, when special bodyguards from the Tower were provided at intervals throughout the evening to escort the members safely through the streets of lawless London. In the Lords the Spiritual Peers attend garbed in long black robes, and sit in an order of precedence established in 1539. There are innumerable other bits of tradition and form in the work of Parliament, some of it amusing and some of it apparently meaningless, but all evidence of the growth of the British system through the vicissitudes and victories of the moving centuries.²⁹

The Question Hour. Although the Cabinet is in a powerful position, Britain has an important Parliamentary device which strengthens the principle of responsibility. This is the Question Hour, held daily in the House of Commons before the regular order of legislative business. At this time, various Ministers read replies to questions which have earlier been submitted by the members. If an inquiry has been directed to one of the Ministers in the Lords, his representative in Commons will make the reply. Questions may be on almost any matter, from the conduct of for-

²⁹ This aspect of the British legislature is dealt with in Michael MacDonagh, *The Pageant of Parliament* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921, 2 vols.).

eign policy to an alleged insult suffered by some constituent at the hands of a policeman. A Minister may decline to answer a question only on grounds that public interest requires the matter to be kept confidential. These inquiries may be followed by subsequent clarifying questions, although no debate is permitted. At the end of the hour, answers to remaining questions will be inserted in the printed record of proceedings. While this is not like the French system of interpellation, which commonly involves debate and a vote as a result of the inquiry, it is a constant and effective means of checking upon the conduct of administrative affairs. It is vastly superior to anything found in the American system, where only sporadic and unsystematic Congressional investigations provide legislators with opportunity for direct questioning of executive officers.

PUBLIC FINANCE

Budget Procedure. As modern government expands its services and controls, its relationship to the national economy becomes of increasing significance. In particular, a government dedicated to socialism, as is the case in Great Britain, cannot hope to achieve its goals unless it is highly competent in fiscal planning and management. Consequently some understanding of public finance is vital in the study of the British system.

Annually, departmental requests for revenue are submitted to the Treasury, which is charged with the routine work of budget preparation. While there are several ministerial officers at the head of the Treasury, they do not function as a group, and the chief financial authority is in the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and, of course, the Prime Minister. The government's program for the next fiscal year is presented to the House of Commons by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the budget speech. In this address the expenditure proposals of the government are outlined, as are the measures for providing the necessary revenues. A complete financial picture is thus given in this general introductory statement. If any new taxes are to be adopted, they go into effect immediately following the budget speech, even though formal legislative authorization has not been given. Normally the Cabinet will secure the full approval of Parliament for these tax proposals, but if some tax measure should fail

of enactment, all funds collected under it would be returned to the taxpayers.

The power of the Cabinet is nowhere more apparent than in the field of finance. The House of Commons may decrease estimates in the budget, but may not increase any items. No additional expenditures may be authorized unless proposed by one of the Ministers. Details are worked out by the Committee of the Whole House on Supply, or the Committee of the Whole House on Ways and Means, depending upon the expenditure or revenue character of the discussion. When all items of appropriation are finally approved, they are combined in a single appropriation bill, while revenue measures are likewise voted separately and then consolidated into one finance bill.

This may be compared with the American system, in which the Executive prepares a budget and submits it to Congress, but from then on the legislature has very much discretion. Items may be added or increased—and frequently are. Tax proposals, on the other hand, may be scaled down or ignored—and this, too, commonly occurs. Throughout the administrations of Franklin D. Roosevelt, for example, the revenue and expenditure recommendations of the President, though not originally in balance, were thrown much more out of relationship by Congresses eager to appropriate, reluctant to tax, and complacent about borrowing. In the American Congress, too, the Senate has just as much authority as does the lower house in financial decisions and may make its own alterations in the program. Ultimately, the President may employ the veto if he believes matters have become excessively unsound, but this extreme step is rarely taken.

On the other hand, the British system is not entirely satisfactory. Its principal disadvantage is the lack of general Parliamentary participation in the formulation of a fiscal program. The Treasury and the leadership within the Cabinet are in such a strong position that they can force through measures which may be very weak in one or another respect, while they also possess a highly effective veto on additional proposals for expenditure or revenues.

Financial Administration. Revenues are collected by various departments, notably the Post Office, Customs, and Inland Revenue, but the Treasury supervises this work. Expenditures are likewise subject to continuing Treasury scrutiny and control. All moneys collected by the public authorities are placed into

one Consolidated Fund, which is deposited with the Bank of England. Until the conclusion of World War II, this important institution was in private hands, but it has now been nationalized.

The process of reviewing completed financial transactions, the post-audit, is in the hands of the Comptroller and Auditor-General, heading a semi-independent Exchequer and Audit Department. Reports from this source go to a standing committee on public accounts in the House of Commons. A notable feature of British financial practice is the custom of appointing the chairman of this committee from the ranks of the Opposition. Forces hostile to the government are thus given full access to any evidence of financial maladministration that may not have been corrected by the Cabinet and Treasury.

Recent Financial Trends. Financial statistics provide but a sketchy picture of a nation's full war costs. The tragedy and the terror of campaigns, the discomforts and scarcities of rationing, and the losses in human resources sustained by a people long under siege, are not all subject to monetary measurement. Nonetheless the economic aspects of war and reconstruction require some appreciation of the financial situation of the central government.

The cost of the recent war to the British government was estimated at close to \$110 billion, of which 49 per cent was paid out of current revenue. The gross national debt mushroomed from \$28 billion in 1939 to \$94 billion in 1946. With rearmament already under way, expenditures in 1938 were \$4.5 billion, and revenues \$3.5 billion. By 1946 the annual expenditure figure had risen to \$24 billion, while revenues exceeded \$12 billion. A heroic tax program was required to support this program, and the number of persons subject to the income tax almost doubled. In 1945, of a total of 13,500,000 taxpayers, almost 12,500,000 had incomes, after taxes, of less than \$2,000. On the other hand, only sixty persons in Great Britain had incomes after taxes of over \$24,000. It should be pointed out, however, that private income in Great Britain increased along with taxes, going from \$20 billion in 1938 to \$37 billion in 1945. Consequently, while the tax rates were sharply increased, the percentage of private income taken by the government in 1945 was 34 per cent, as against 23 per cent in 1938.³⁰

³⁰ For more complete figures, see *National Income and Expenditure of the United Kingdom 1938-1945*, Cmd. 6784 (1946). Pound sterling converted at \$4.00.

Britain liquidated half or more of her \$16 billion of foreign holdings during the war, and built up additional obligations in many parts of the world, totaling about \$16 billion. This drastic loss in revenue from overseas assets, plus the drain of new obligations held by creditors abroad, makes a vigorous export program a major necessity if Britain is to achieve healthy economic recovery. The drain of war is ended at home, however, and expenditures and taxes have been reduced. Although the budget for 1946-47 was not yet in balance, government outlay was down to \$15.5 billion, and revenues were set at \$12.5 billion.

LAW AND THE COURTS

The Anglican Legal System. Western civilization has two chief systems of law. Continental nations and their possessions follow the Romanesque pattern, a modernized version of the ancient Roman law. This prevails, too, in Latin-America, and in Louisiana and Quebec. It is law based upon a carefully drafted code, and it is therefore systematized and consistent, with a nice integration of all its parts. On the other hand, the vast portion of the globe under the influence of the English-speaking nations is primarily subject to the Anglican legal system, developed from the common law and equity of England. There are exceptions here, for in some sections of the British Empire other legal principles are utilized. This is true of the Union of South Africa and Ceylon, as well as Quebec. Moreover the British colonial system embraces peoples who continue to follow their original legal rules in private and local affairs. In Africa and the Near East the Anglican system thus functions in juxtaposition with the third great international legal structure, Moslem law.³¹

The common law originated as case law. It grew out of the needs and the customs of the people. Like the British Constitution, then, the system is complex and difficult to grasp. Its vitality, however, lies in the fact that it evolved largely as a spontaneous expression of the practice and the moral and ethical convictions

³¹ For a well-illustrated introduction to the leading systems of law, see John H. Wigmore, *A Panorama of the World's Legal Systems* (Washington: Washington Law Book Company, Library Ed., 1936). An Appendix, pp. 1133-1146, provides a useful map indicating the geographical distribution of various types of law throughout the world. This map, in color, is in Wigmore, "A Map of the World's Law," *Geographic Review*, XIX (January, 1929), p. 114.

of the individuals under its jurisdiction. The system grew slowly through the centuries following the Norman conquest, but took solid form with the growing emphasis upon the principle of *stare decisis*—the strict observance of precedents. Strength was added by the systematic treatises of the great jurists whose contributions appeared between the twelfth and eighteenth centuries. Glanvil and Bracton, Fortescue and Littleton, Coke and Blackstone, these and many more played a constructive role by writing general surveys and analytical studies of the growing body of English law. The influence of the common law in the American colonies was based upon the natural transfer of the English system to the new world by lawyers trained in Britain. Colonial leaders, including many active in the Continental Congress, the Philadelphia Convention, and the early National and State governments, were greatly influenced by Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, first published in 1765. By the time of the American Revolution, hundreds of copies of this great work were in the hands of the jurists of this country, and the many subsequent editions were read as eagerly by the increasing number of lawyers and judges of the United States.

A supplemental feature of the English system came with the growth and development of equity. This body of law came into being with petitions to the King for the redress of errors or the adjustment of flaws in the application of the common law. As its name indicates, equity sought to introduce a greater measure of practical justice in some of the inflexible rules of the common law. As these petitions increased, the Kings turned them over to the Chancellors for decision. The Chancellors were in those days learned churchmen, and the principles of justice which they followed were drawn from their own wisdom and their religious experience. In time, the determinations in equity came to be reported and studied, and its precedents were followed. It, too, thus became a relatively rigid system interlocking with the common law. Thus the common law rules relate chiefly to controversies where settlement by money damages is fair and practicable. Equity deals with situations where monetary considerations do not provide effective redress: cases involving accident, mistake, fraud, trusts, specific performance, and injunctions, to cite a few. Although the courts of common law jurisdiction and the Chancery courts were long separate, the Act of Judicature of 1873 merged the administration of justice in both types of cases.

This is true also in the American National government, and in most of the States, although a few of the States continue to have separate courts of common law and of equity.

A third source of English law is legislative enactment. Policy determinations by the King in council have long contributed to the expansion of the system, but this statutory content has become of increasing importance in the modern era. Nevertheless the rights and duties of citizens in their private affairs are substantially the outgrowth of centuries of judicial lawmaking, and only secondarily based upon bills passed by Parliament.

Courts and the Judiciary. Civil justice is administered through a hierarchy of courts largely, though not entirely, separate from the criminal courts. At the base are the County Courts, dealing with matters of minor importance, their jurisdiction generally measured by the amount of money involved in a controversy. Having concurrent jurisdiction with these courts in more important cases, and also serving as an appellate tribunal, is the High Court of Justice, which meets in three divisions: (1) the Chancery Division, dealing with such matters as wills, trusts, and mortgages; (2) the King's Bench Division, administering the common law in London and on circuit; and (3) the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, consisting of special courts stemming from certain aspects of the old common law. Finally there is a Court of Appeal, made up of the Lord Chancellor as nominal head, but for most practical purposes directed by the Master of the Rolls, and with certain other judges including the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary and the Lords Justices of Appeal. This tribunal has jurisdiction in cases appealed from one of the divisions of the High Court of Justice, and may also hear certain appeals directly from the County Courts. The Court of Appeals and the High Court of Justice are together designated the Supreme Court of Judicature, but this is a court in nomenclature only, and merely indicates the close unification of the higher English judiciary in the handling of civil litigation.

Criminal justice is dispensed in minor instances by local justices. In the smaller and rural areas, these officers are unpaid Justices of the Peace, and in the larger centers of population the work is performed by more fully qualified and salaried Stipendiary Magistrates. From the Justices Courts of Petty Sessions there may be some appeal to the Courts of Quarter Sessions. These are composed of all Justices of the Peace of a County, and in

addition to appellate work, they have original jurisdiction in cases involving more serious crimes. Major criminal matters, however, are heard at Assize, by judges of the King's Bench Division traveling on circuit. For metropolitan London such cases are tried in the Central Criminal Court, commonly termed Old Bailey. Since 1907 there has also been a higher Court of Criminal Appeal, composed of judges assigned from the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice. Thus while civil and criminal matters are largely administered in separate systems of courts, there is an inter-relationship within the judicial structure through the judges of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice. The jury system continues to be an important element in the British system, although in 1939 the war emergency led to an act reducing juries in most criminal cases to not more than seven persons, instead of the traditional twelve. The old grand jury method of indictment was eliminated in 1933 in favor of indictment by information.

As has been indicated, certain important civil and criminal cases may ultimately be appealed to the House of Lords, although this privilege is strictly limited. Another legal institution of great authority in the English system is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This consists of the Lord Chancellor and Law Lords, any former Lord Chancellors, the Lord President of the Council, some judges appointed from various parts of the Empire, and certain other Councillors. This body of some twenty judges sits as a committee of the Privy Council to hear appeals from certain Empire Courts, and from the Ecclesiastical Courts of England. The Statute of Westminster in 1931 gave the Dominions the right to block appeals from their own courts, and South Africa and Australia do so frequently, while the Irish Free State abolished this type of appeal in 1933. Despite these and other restrictions, a number of cases still go to the "Supreme Court of Empire" from the Dominions, India, and other outlying areas subject to British control. This body does not hand down a decision, for it is in form not a court but a body of advisors to the King. Its determinations are thus issued by the Crown as Orders in Council.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

General Structure. Urban and rural local government in England developed from Anglo-Saxon times to a nineteenth-century agglomeration of conflicting, overlapping, and competing jurisdictions. The expansion of individual and group needs in the industrial age multiplied the number and extent of services rendered by local government. New responsibilities were assigned independently and casually to existing units or to special districts, adding to the confusion of authority and making efficiency more and more difficult to achieve. Ultimately, beginning with the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, Parliament adopted a series of measures which, extending over a century, gradually reorganized the local government pattern. However, historic influences were in many cases too strong to be overcome, while future requirements were not properly anticipated. Thus there are still many geographical and functional shortcomings in local administration and service in the United Kingdom.

Today local government is provided through units of seven major types: administrative counties, county boroughs, municipal boroughs, urban districts, rural districts, parishes, and in a class by itself, the metropolitan county of London. Relationships of these units may first be considered geographically. The administrative county, of which there are 62, is basic to the whole system, and is divided into rural districts and urban districts on a basis of population. These districts are in turn divided into rural and urban parishes, which are chiefly of ecclesiastical rather than civil importance. Interspersed throughout are boroughs, or chartered municipalities. The larger cities are organized as county boroughs, so called because the area they occupy is independent from the administrative county within whose borders they are located. The administrative counties and county boroughs are thus the chief instruments of local government. Smaller communities are organized as municipal boroughs, but each of these is somewhat integrated with the administrative county of which it is a part.³²

Organization and Powers. Administrative counties are directed

³² For national purposes of justice and Parliamentary representation, the boundaries of the 52 older of "historic" counties have been retained. But the administrative counties, which in many instances have the same lines as the historic counties, render the essential local services.

by elective councillors chosen for three-year terms from single-member districts. The Representation of the People Act of 1945 eliminated the remaining property qualifications in local elections, adding an estimated 7,000,000 electors to the county and borough rolls. The number of councillors to be chosen varies with the size of the county. This elected group selects aldermen who serve six-year terms, half of these being renewed every three years. Aldermen number one-third of the councillors. They participate in the work of the council on a plane of full equality with the popularly elected members. And they constitute an element of experience and leadership not always secured in the process of direct election. The council chooses a county chairman, generally from its own membership. As his title suggests, this officer has no particular executive authority apart from the activities of the council.

The county council acts as an agency of administrative supervision, determines questions of local finance, including tax levies, and also directs the educational system. It relies heavily upon its committees in these matters. The continuing administration of the county is in the hands of experts appointed by the council on an essentially non-political basis. Although not strictly on civil service, these administrators usually enjoy tenure as long as they perform capably. The county has responsibility in matters of general application, while the rural and urban districts render service in more limited fields such as sanitation or licensing.

Boroughs, like counties, are organized with elective councils, plus aldermen, and in each case with a chairman called, of course, the mayor. Councillors come from multi-member districts designated as wards. Commonly a ward will provide three councillors, one of them elected each year. The mayor's position is not one of administrative superiority, but is rather a role of ceremonial dignity. The borough council issues appropriate local ordinances, handles local funds and levies taxes, and appoints the permanent administrative staff.

The Governments of London. Turning briefly to the world's greatest metropolitan center, it is quickly apparent that there is no single, unified authority which dominates the area. Thus it is most appropriate to use the plural phrase, the governments of London. The most important general unit is an administrative county, but unlike the other members of this class, it is an urban

rather than a rural unit. Linked with this county in a kind of federation are twenty-eight metropolitan boroughs, and in addition the historic City of London. This is a small area about a mile square, with a resident population of a few thousand, a governmental structure based upon three councils, and headed by one of the most colorful dignitaries of the realm, the Lord Mayor of London.

There is also a metropolitan water board superimposed over the area, while the police system is directly controlled by the Home Office. The London police district covers an area of some 700 miles, while the administrative county extends over a much smaller territory of about 115 miles. Anyone living in the police district calls himself a Londoner, so the government of the entire metropolis thus involves a complex number of local districts which are beyond the boundaries of the central administrative county.

Central Government Control. There is no clear policy or program of central direction of local affairs in Britain. Yet the entire structure and functioning of local government depends upon the central authorities. Parliament determines basic structure and powers, but innumerable details are subject to determinations emanating from the Whitehall departments. The Home Office exercises supervision in police affairs, and similar functional jurisdiction resides with the other ministries, notably Health and Education, Transport and Trade, Labor and Agriculture. This power is based both upon direct legal superiority and upon the fact that grants-in-aid are important in such local fields as education. With the expansion of activity by the several departments chiefly associated with the government's postwar program of economic and social reform, the central direction of local affairs is steadily increasing. This places new emphasis upon the need for additional rationalization of local government structure and functions. At the same time, the element of popular local participation in administration traditional to the English system will not be jeopardized in the course of these adjustments.³³

³³ Wartime trends are reviewed in Edward W. Weidner, "Trends in English Local Government, 1944," *American Political Science Review*, XXXIX, No. 2 (April, 1945), pp. 337-349. See also H. J. Laski, W. I. Jennings, and W. A. Robson, *A Century of Municipal Progress* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935), and W. A. Robson, *The Government and Misgovernment of London* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1939).

POSTWAR POLICIES AND PROBLEMS

The Impact of War. After a prolonged period of economic difficulty only partly mitigated by a modest program of social insurance, Britain experienced the ironic paradox of prosperity in the midst of disaster. The armed services and war industries drew all able-bodied men, and a great proportion of women, into the national effort. Income increased and savings expanded. Many individuals were subject for the first time to taxation by the lowering of exemptions, but others became ratepayers by virtue of higher individual and family incomes than they had enjoyed in the prewar era. Records of production for war stood in dramatic contrast against peacetime achievements. Rationing assured a sharing of goods which symbolized the equal liability of all to peril. The democracy of the air raid shelter was not sufficient to destroy concepts of aristocracy, but nevertheless it was typical of the leveling effects of the war in the national psychology.

In 1941 the Atlantic Charter, a tremendous boost to morale at a time when the military situation was critical, spoke to the world in terms which had not been fully realized in Britain. It was thus the forerunner of a liberalization of policy under the Churchill government in many social and economic fields. Before hostilities ended, the promises of a better material life in victory were on the way toward practical implementation through plans announced in Parliament by various Cabinet leaders. By 1945, the issues joined between the Conservatives and Laborites were largely matters of theory and administrative means; there was very considerable agreement as to immediate objectives. Whether or not these goals could be achieved most quickly and enduringly through a maximum or minimum amount of central government ownership and direction, there was general acceptance of the thesis in the oft-quoted lines from Goldsmith:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.

Social Insurance. The Atlantic Charter stated as an aim of the war "the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security . . ." and looked forward to a peace "which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear

and want." These phrases may well be regarded as heralding a turning point in British social policy, for it was in this spirit that the Churchill government constructed its postwar program. At the end of 1942 the advent of this program was more clearly marked by the report issued by Sir William Beveridge in which was outlined an expanded and comprehensive system of social insurance, veritably a "cradle to the grave" blueprint of basic economic security.³⁴ On the basis of very wide coverage of the population, protection was to include unemployment, medical, accident, marriage, maternity and children's allowance, retirement, and funeral benefits. While certain of these categories of insurance were already under government protection, the new plan increased both the amount and classes of benefits. Moreover, extension of the program was promised, particularly in the medical field. The Attlee government made no fundamental changes in these proposals, but simply elaborated upon them. Main provisions of the National Health Insurance Bill of 1946, for example, were substantially the same as those proposed in the Social Insurance plan of the former government, but included somewhat more generous benefits.³⁵

Child health, in terms of food as well as the prevention and cure of disease, is an important objective of the welfare program. Wartime rationing meant deprivation for many, but it also meant an adequate diet for everyone. This was an improvement for the millions of families that had been existing on a substandard basis, and it carried Britain's children through the conflict to a condition of general health better than at any time in history. This was some comfort, but it also produced determination to accomplish as much for the children in peace as was achieved in war. Contributing particularly to this aim was the Family Allowances measure enacted in 1945, providing a small weekly subsidy to a family for each child beyond the first. This was estimated to cost some \$228,000,000 the first year of operation. A program of free meals and milk for children in grant-aided

³⁴ *Social Insurance and Allied Services*, Beveridge Report, Cmd. 6404 (1942). This was also issued in New York by the Macmillan Company, under authorization of His Majesty's Stationery Office.

³⁵ *National Insurance Bill, 1946, Summary of Main Provisions of the National Insurance Scheme*, Cmd. 6729 (1946). Appendix I compares the main benefit rates of the Labor scheme with the proposals of the Churchill government in *Social Insurance, Part I*, Cmd. 6550 (1944).

schools was also begun, the annual expense of this assistance to reach some \$240,000,000.

To coordinate and direct the many aspects of the burgeoning welfare program of postwar Britain, a new department was created in 1945, the Ministry of National Insurance. To it were assigned the responsibilities in the social assistance field formerly exercised by the Ministry of Health, Secretary of State for Scotland, Ministry of Labor, and the Home Secretary.

Education. The "Giant Evils" of modern society, according to Sir William Beveridge, are fivefold: Want, Disease, Ignorance, Squalor, and Idleness. Social insurance provides weapons against the first two of these, and the third, ignorance, is being attacked through an expansion of the British educational system. In the past, education beyond the high school level was largely limited to individuals of superior wealth, even with a rather extensive number of scholarships. Under the Education Act of 1944 the age of compulsory school attendance was increased from 14 to 15, with 16 as the ultimate goal. Persons leaving school at the minimum age must attend part-time to the age of 18. Scholarship aid is being very considerably augmented, and a training program for thousands of additional teachers is in process. Better salaries and working conditions will aid in the recruitment of desirable personnel, while many new schools are to be added. The United Kingdom proposes to develop an educational establishment adequate to equip its citizens for their postwar tasks and their peacetime leisure.

Physical Planning and Housing. Almost as soon as Britain began to be devastated by air attacks, a program of rebuilding was inaugurated. An expert committee on Compensation and Betterment was appointed in January, 1941, and in October of that year a committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas was set up. The reports of these two bodies laid the groundwork for the program entrusted to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning, which was established early in 1942.³⁶ Legislation was enacted placing all of England and Wales under central planning authority for urban and rural development. This underlies and facilitates the work of other Ministries in the fields of housing, health, and related matters. Britain long suffered from

³⁶ *Compensation and Betterment*, Uthwatt Report, Cmd. 6386 (1942); *Land Utilisation in Rural Areas*, Scott Report, Cmd. 6378 (1942).

substandard living quarters in the vast slums of her unplanned cities and towns.

Not only is the postwar program one of replacement and repair of war-destroyed and -damaged structures, but it involves a general drive against the evil of squalor. In 1946 a wave of "squatters" moved into unoccupied dwellings in many parts of the country as the population grew impatient with the continuation of the housing shortage. This but spurred existing efforts to complete the restoration of repairable shelter and the construction of new homes. Monthly reports of the government indicated considerable steady progress in this direction. Ultimate goals of three to four million homes have been set, and will take up to 10 years to attain. At the end of that time, the existence of an overinflated building industry is prophesied. But the immediate need for housing is being met, and the future problem is not standing as a deterrent to present action.

Production and Employment. The relationship between idleness and the other evils mentioned in the Beveridge analysis is indicated in the following comment: "The first duty of Government is to protect the country from external aggression. The next aim of national policy must be to secure the general prosperity and happiness of the citizens. To realise that aim, two courses of action must be followed. The first is to foster the national power to produce and to earn, with its accompanying opportunities for increased well-being, leisure and recreation. The second is to plan for the prevention of individual poverty resulting from those hazards of personal fortune over which individuals have little or no control."⁸⁷

The battle for security must be a total attack on all fronts, for without a sufficient national income, insurance pledges cannot long be honored. Thus employment and production are keys to the success of Britain's effort. These are to be obtained by the stabilization of purchasing power through the social insurance program; the rationalization of the nation's productive facilities and the nationalization of major segments of the economy; and the expansion of exports under the effective slogan, "Britain Delivers the Goods."

An early step of the Attlee government was the nationalization of the Bank of England, which had long occupied a major place

⁸⁷ *Social Insurance, Part I*, Cmd. 6550 (1944), p. 3.

in public financial matters. Other plans, slower to come to fruition, have been directed at industries such as coal and steel. The government has taken over the coal industry on the basis of outright ownership, with the dispossessed owners to receive fair compensation. The National Coal Board took over actual operation of the mines before completion of the compensation formula. A distribution of Industry Act was passed in 1945 to facilitate the creation of new industrial and trading centers and to avoid so far as possible a repetition of the depressed areas which developed after World War I.

A substantial amount of socialization is likewise planned in the agricultural areas. Wartime levels of production are to be continued, with guaranteed minimum returns for agricultural employees, planned quotas of output, and with compulsory controls in reserve to secure maximum utilization of farm lands. High levels of agricultural production are sought to reduce imports and thus increase the net returns from exports. This will, moreover, assist agricultural workers to carry their share of financing the national insurance scheme. However, there are many pitfalls in the path of such a program. Statistical controls for the farm are more complex and difficult to administer than in the factory. An unknown factor is the extent to which farmers will respond with the necessary enthusiasm to government direction in peacetime.

RECENT TRENDS

During 1947-1948, Great Britain, already engaged in a struggle to improve its trade deficit with the United States and other scarce currency countries, was nearer and nearer the crisis climax. The people lived once again in the blackout that they thought had ended in 1945. Coal exports were prohibited, newsprint allocations were diminished, some periodicals were suspended and food shortage appeared. Unemployment was rising. On February 21, 1947, at the height of the crisis, the government published a significant document, the *Economic Survey for 1947*; the exposition of the state of affairs and call to action had been planned to appear at an earlier date, but the crisis forced the authorities to revise the estimates and delay publication. This "White Paper" set forth eloquently the nation's foreign trade predicament. "We could live without new radio sets and furniture, but we cannot

live without imported food. We could indeed at a pinch live without new houses and holidays, but our national existence becomes quite impossible if we cannot produce enough coal and electric power." The export goals and the production tasks—now harder to achieve because of the setback—were reset. The public was urged to work "with the same determination that marked the country's effort during the war and has inspired the people during the difficulties of the past months." Chancellor of the Exchequer Hugh Dalton's budget of April 15, 1947 provided for a 50 per cent increase in the tobacco duty. On May 1, the 5-day week for miners was introduced, but after a slight spurt the output of coal dropped in the summer months, as had been prophesized. The adverse balance of trade grew worse and the export goal of 140 per cent of the pre-war figure set for the end of 1947 in the *Economic Survey* had to be postponed. At the same time, the American loan was fast running out, and by March 3, 1948, Britain had exhausted the \$3,750,000,000 loan made by the United States in July of 1946, although Britain had expected it to last three to five years and go far toward re-establishment of its post-war industrial reconstruction. Instead, the funds melted away in the face of inflated prices, greater needs than anticipated for dollars to buy perishable items such as food and rising post-war expenses. While needing additional credits to bolster its development and export programs, Britain faced the making of plans in the next three years to start repayment of the \$3,750,000,000 loan and a \$650,000,000 settlement on Lend-Lease (lumped together with the loan as a single debt). But, fortunately, the grant provided in the so-called Marshall plan was already at that time on the horizon, and since the plan was passed in the spring of 1948, Britain's share in the appropriations provided another breathing spell for its creaking and decrepit economic joints. Thus England's very survival was closely tied to the success of the Marshall Plan.

The Big Freeze. Within the Marshall Plan breathing space, Britain must make "a supreme effort" to boost exports and narrow the financial gap. On February 12, 1948, in the House of Commons, Sir Stafford Cripps defended the government's urgent request for a wage freeze to halt the fatal rise costs in production. The House followed him with close attention and in dead silence while he outlined a policy repugnant to a socialist government, dependent on labor support for its survival. Unions representing

2,500,000 shipbuilding and engineering workers and 250,000 civil servants had already defied the government and vowed to go ahead with current wage negotiations. Unions representing 4,000,000 more workers also considered pressing wage claims. And in the House, 21 Labourites took the lead against their own party's wage-freezing policy. To forestall the labor revolt, Cripps promised that prices would also be frozen. But could Sir Stafford, the keen-minded jockey make the massive, stubborn trades union movement take even this first unpleasant jump?

All in all, Marshall Plan aid—like loans in the past—could postpone catastrophe and buy Britain more recovery time. An economic "White Paper," to be published soon, assumed this, because, as one Briton put it, "the alternative would be just too bloody awful."

Changes in the Government. The most striking changes in the top governmental posts in 1947, in addition to the appointment of Sir Stafford Cripps as Minister for Economic Affairs, were Prime Minister Atlee's Cabinet changes of October 7, 1947, and the resignation of Chancellor of the Exchequer Hugh Dalton on November 13. Dalton's sudden resignation was due to his "grave indiscretion," of disclosing tax secrets to a newspaper reporter as he entered the House to make a budget speech. The Labour Party retained its standing in Parliament as a result of the by-elections held in 1947, although it suffered some losses in municipal elections.

The Weakening of the House of Lords. Six hundred years of conflict were reaching a climax as the House of Lords faced reform in 1947-48. The government's proposal that the delaying power of the House of Lords on legislation be limited to one year instead of the existing two years, made in the King's speech at the opening of Parliament on October 21, 1947, caused strong opposition protests and wide discussion. But all parties having agreed to consider reform, the powers of the second Chamber were going to be altered. To be sure, the Labour Party had its staunch left-wingers who wanted to emulate Cromwell and abolish the House of Lords altogether, but a vast majority in the Party and the country believed in a two-chamber government. The general assumption was that the Labour Government was concerned about the possible blocking of the bill nationalizing the iron and steel industry (not yet introduced) until after the end of the present Parliament, even if the Labor Government

should last out its full term, 1945-50. Then, for the first time in history, the House of Lords in this generation became more numerous than the House of Commons; there were 640 members of the Commons and 793 peers. However, it was not representative of the people because it was composed mainly of the second, third and fourth generations of peers created since Victorian times; only one-half of the peers could date their peerages before 1881; five hundred and sixty-nine peerages have been created since 1901. The hereditary principle is stronger now than ever, and it was this which everybody agreed must either be abolished or be severely curtailed. The numbers of the Lords will probably be reduced to 300 or 350; party strength will be equalized and many or most of the peers will be elected and perhaps paid for their services.

Changes in Privy Council. On January 13, 1947, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest tribunal of the British Empire, delivered a judgment that signed away its right to hear appeals from any Canadian Court. It upheld the power of the Canadian Parliament to amend the Supreme Court Act of Canada so as to abolish the right of appeal to the Privy Council from any Canadian Court, Federal or Provincial. This case, one of highest constitutional importance to the British Empire, had been pending since 1940, but a judgment was postponed until after World War II.

In 1939 the Canadian House of Commons gave its first reading to a bill abolishing appeals to the Privy Council. The competency of the Canadian Parliament to enact such a measure was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada which decided by a majority that the legislature was within its right. The Provincial courts of Canada challenged this judgment as a violation of their rights within the Federation and the case was referred to the Privy Council by the Governor General of Canada.

Delivering its judgment, the Judicial Committee, headed by the Lord Chancellor, Lord Jowitt, stated that earlier rights had been superseded by the Statute of Westminster of 1931, by which the relationship of the Dominions to Britain was regulated. Under the Statute the only visible link between the Dominions and Britain is maintained through the British Throne.

The right of appeal to the King in Council was conferred by acts of the Imperial Parliament and as such, under an act of 1865, could not be abrogated by a legislature set up in Canada.

But, observed the judgment, "this restriction or fetter upon the legislative power of the Dominion" has been removed by the Statute of Westminster. It would contradict the spirit of the Statute, the committee said, "to concede anything less than the widest amplitude of power to the Dominion legislature." *

* For more details on the recent changes in England's government and politics, see: James K. Pollock, ed., *Change and Crisis in European Government* (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1947, chapter "Postwar Politics in Great Britain"; P. W. Buck & J. W. Masland, *The Governments of Foreign Powers* (New York: Henry Holt, 1947); David Fellman, ed., *Post-War Governments of Europe* (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publ. Co., 1946), chapter on "England under the Labour Government."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARKER, SIR ERNEST, Ed., *The Character of England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948). Articles depicting the qualities and spirit of present-day England and the English people.
- BEVIN, ERNEST, *The Balance Sheet of the Future* (New York: Robert McBride & Co., 1941). Britain's position as seen by her wartime Minister of Labour and postwar Foreign Secretary.
- BREBNER, D. W., and NEVINS, ALLAN, *The English People* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1943). A useful sketch of the cavalcade of British political growth.
- BROGAN, D. W., *The English People* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1943). A frank and entertaining study of the participants in the drama of British democracy.
- DICEY, A. V., *Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 9th ed., 1939). A leading work on the legal aspects of the English system.
- GREAVES, H. R. G., *The British Constitution* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1938). A well-balanced study of the growth and operation of the machinery of British government.
- HASTINGS, MARGARET, *The Court of Common Pleas in Fifteenth Century England* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1947). A study of English late medieval legal history, drawn from the sources of the 15th century plea rolls.
- HEMINGFORD, DENNIS H. H., 1st Baron, *What Parliament Is and Does* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948). A brief, elementary introduction to the British parliamentary system.
- HILL, NORMAN L., and STOKE, HAROLD W., *The Background of European Governments* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1935). Part I. A collection of well-selected source materials.
- , *Parliament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939). The leading study of the legislature of England.
- , *The British Constitution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941). Readably reviews the fundamentals of the British system of government.
- HOGG, QUINTIN, *The Purpose of Parliament* (London: Blandford Press, 1946). A keen analysis of the institutional and psychological basis for Britain's parliamentary democracy, by a leader of the younger Conservatives.
- KRAUS, R., *The Men Around Churchill* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1941). Lively biographical accounts of the British leaders of World War II.
- MCCALLUM, R. B., and READMAN, ALISON, *The British General Election of 1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947). A re-

- markably cogent analysis of the issues, the campaign and the results. MUIR, RAMSAY, *How Britain Is Governed* (London: Arnold Constable Co., 4th ed., 1939). Still a useful basic study.
- STRAUSS, P., *Bevin and Co., The Leaders of British Labor* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1941). Careers and characteristics of the men who came to power in 1945.
- TREVELYAN, GEORGE M., *A Shortened History of England* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1942). A compact work by one of Britain's great historians.
- WARREN, J. H., *The English Local Government System* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948). A concise account of the English local government system from the administrative point of view.
- WEBB, SIDNEY, and BEATRICE, *A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920). The co-founders of the Fabian Society present a program which still influences Labor's outlook.

SECTION II

THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH AND EMPIRE

The defeat of the great Armada in 1588 paved the way for Britain's acquisition of an Empire. With naval strength to combat the power of Spain, England's great sea captains embarked on voyages of exploration and expeditions of annexation, spurred by the same impulses that led to the original settlement of the British Isles by continental adventurers. Trade and loot, conquest and settlement, were interrelated in the expansion of British influence throughout the world. From the early seventeenth century to the beginning of the twentieth, this process continued. Today the complex political system linked together in varying degrees of authority under the King Emperor embraces over 550,000,000 people, or more than a quarter of the world's population, and includes 16,000,000 square miles of territory.

Britain acquired her world position partly by design and partly by chance. Some possessions were taken for strategic reasons; some were obtained as a result of war; and still others were absorbed to forestall the imperial schemes of rival powers. The methods

used were those standard in such matters, a combination of diplomacy and force. The expansionist policies of all the great powers contain many grim and sordid chapters. Inevitably the greatest Empire of them all has had its full share of unsavory incidents in the course of time. As early as 1726 a caustic voice was raised against the methods of colonial conquest, when the famed traveler Lemuel Gulliver felt called upon to explain his failure to clarify the precise geographical location of the curious places he had visited, in order to permit them to be claimed for Britain. After citing certain reasons for his hesitancy, the good Gulliver wrote: "But I had another reason which made me less forward to enlarge his Majesty's dominions by my discoveries. To say the truth, I had conceived a few scruples with relation to the distributive justice of princes upon those occasions. For instance, a crew of pirates are driven by a storm they know not whither, at length a boy discovers land from the topmast, they go on shore to rob and plunder, they see an harmless people, are entertained with kindness, they give the country a new name, they take formal possession of it for their King, they set up a rotten plank or a stone for a memorial, they murder two or three dozen of the natives, bring away a couple more by force for a sample, return home, and get their pardon. Here commences a new dominion acquired with a title by *divine right*. Ships are sent with the first opportunity, the natives driven out or destroyed, their princes tortured to discover their gold, a free licence given to all acts of inhumanity and lust, the earth reeking with the blood of its inhabitants: and this execrable crew of butchers employed in so pious an expedition, is a *modern colony* sent to convert and civilize an idolatrous and barbarous people."

The writer hastens, however, to absolve his own country from such imputation: "But this description, I confess, doth by no means affect the British nation, who may be an example to the whole world for their wisdom, care, and justice in planting colonies; their liberal endowments for the advancement of religion and learning; their choice of devout and able pastors to propagate Christianity; their caution in stocking their provinces with people of sober lives and conversations from this the mother kingdom; their strict regard for the distribution of justice, in supplying the civil administration through all their colonies with officers of the greatest abilities, utter strangers to corruption; and to crown all, by sending the most vigilant and virtuous governors,

who have no other views than the happiness of the people over whom they preside, and the honour of the King their master.”¹

This is still a classic indictment of British imperial politics. At the same time, the two hundred years which have elapsed since the passage was written have changed many aspects of the picture. In the twentieth century, particularly, the tempo of reform has been stepped up to the point where the London government is clearly pledged to the realization of a policy which Swift outlined in satire. The noble sentiments of the Atlantic Charter have not only affected the course of events in England, but have reverberated throughout the Empire. The commitment to “respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live . . .” has significant implications in the future of Empire relations. So, too, has the promise of international economic collaboration “with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.” Moreover, the famous goal of “freedom from fear and want” is envisioned for “all the men in all the lands.”

These enticing incentives to action against the Axis were quickly endorsed by the other United Nations. A major step toward practical implementation was taken at San Francisco in 1945 with the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter reaffirmed the importance of world economic betterment, and pledged the nations to promote “universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.”² Moreover, in the Declaration Regarding Non-Self-Governing Territories, the following undertaking is accepted by each colonial power: “Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end: a. to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational ad-

¹ Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver's Travels* (New York: Modern Library, 1931), pp. 334-335.

² Article 55, c.

vancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses; b. to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement . . ."³

In keeping with these provisions, which she helped to draft, Britain is proceeding with a broad program of economic development, education, and political tutelage for the peoples under her jurisdiction. The era of mercantilist exploitation of colonies for the exclusive benefit of the mother country is in process of full liquidation. There are many sore spots, and progress will be slow. The British Empire is not likely to be dissolved, but rather is it being transformed into a world community of mature, self-governing units associated for purposes of mutual welfare and security.

THE PANORAMA OF EMPIRE GOVERNMENT

The British Empire falls roughly into two parts: the lands that were largely peopled by the British and other Europeans; and the territories with substantial indigenous populations, where British rule has been imposed without extensive new settlement. This general classification provides some explanation of the distinction to be drawn between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the other parts of the Empire.

Institutions are patterns of behavior. They are not objects to be exported. However, people accustomed to certain institutional procedures will commonly continue to follow them. Thus it is that British immigrants in the New World, the South Pacific, and to a certain extent South Africa, developed forms of government very similar to those of the homeland. Indeed, one of the reasons for the separation of the American colonies from the British system was a desire for the fullest enjoyment of the rights which had become part of the English heritage. The adamant position of Britain in this struggle—though the Americans were not without support in Parliament—led to a complete severance of political ties. Britain profited from her failure, however, and when a comparable situation arose in Canada in 1837, Lord Durham was sent to investigate. His famous Report in 1839 became the basis

³ Article 73.

for a new type of imperial relationship. In matters which concerned the whole Empire, the Governor-General was to follow the authority of the Crown. But on local and internal subjects, the King's representative was to accept the "advice" of a Cabinet representing the majority party of the Dominion Parliament.

This principle of "responsible government" satisfied the Canadians, and became the pattern for the other Dominions. As time went on, the supremacy of the London government was slowly reduced, and World War I saw the emergence of a relationship of near-equality among Britain and the Dominions. Each of these governments participated separately in the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, and obtained individual membership in the League of Nations. The nature of this partnership was described at the Imperial Conference of 1926 in the following terms: "They are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations."⁴ In 1931 Parliament enacted the Statute of Westminster in an effort to put this declaration into legal form. In practice, however, the Statute merely reemphasized the growing freedom of action of the Commonwealth governments, for it provided that acts of Parliament were applicable to these areas only with their express consent. The vigorous participation in United Nations affairs of Commonwealth leaders such as Dr. Evatt of Australia, Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada, and Marshal Smuts of South Africa, reflected in recent years the full equality of Commonwealth nations in the international community. Canada has enacted its own citizenship law, so that its people are no longer classed as "British subjects." Indeed, it may be said that the term Dominion is now applicable to the British Commonwealth only in historic terms, for each of the members is in fact a free and fully self-governing nation. The great nations of the Empire are today held together by the firm but flexible ties of tradition and mutual interest, rather than by the brittle shackles of force.

At the time of the enactment of the Statute of Westminster, the British Commonwealth consisted of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland,

⁴ *Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1926*, Cmd. 2768 (1926).

and the Irish Free State. However, the impact of world depression was so severe in Newfoundland that she yielded her Dominion status in 1933 and again became a Crown Colony. Moreover, constitutional changes in the Irish Free State in 1937 placed that nation on the extreme periphery of the British system, for in addition to adopting the formal title of Eire, or Ireland, she eliminated all recognition of British authority except for the formality of appointing ambassadors and other foreign representatives in the name of the King. Throughout World War II, Ireland remained neutral, a definitive indication of the complete freedom of action which the Commonwealth nations enjoy.⁵

India and Burma have special status within the Empire. Pending final constitutional arrangements for self-government following World War II, they were designated Members of the Commonwealth. This nominal adjustment was subject to the ultimate decision of each government, however, although the British clearly desired a continuing friendly association with these nations.

The balance of the Empire is a congeries of Crown Colonies with varying degrees of self-government; Protectorates; former Turkish and German Colonies held in Mandate; former Italian Colonies in Africa occupied pending final disposition, probably under United Nations Trusteeship; and two areas held in condominium—the New Hebrides, and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

CANADA

The People and the Economy. The northern neighbor of the United States occupies a land area of 3,700,000 square miles and has a population of 12,250,000. Although in physical size it exceeds the United States, much of the land is uninhabitable due to the cold climate, and the bulk of the people live in the areas near the American border.

French and English stocks predominate, the former accounting for almost a third of the population. Concentrated largely in the province of Quebec, the French-Canadians are a cultural minority of distinct importance. Long separated from the polit-

⁵ The Irish policy was carried to such an extreme that Prime Minister de Valera went in person to the German Minister on May 3, 1945 to offer condolences on the reported death of Adolf Hitler.

ical changes of modern France, they have at the same time resisted assimilation into the British system except where that has been unavoidable. Strongly Roman Catholic, with a system of Romanesque law, these people have obtained for themselves a kind of special autonomy within the federal structure of Canada.

Canadian agriculture is extensive and varied, ranging from crops such as wheat, oats, and barley, through cattle, hogs, and sheep, to timber, furs, and fisheries. In the twentieth century, industrial growth has been pronounced. Much American capital has been invested there, especially since the adoption of a system of tariff preferences for goods produced within the Empire. Thus automobiles produced in Canadian branch plants of the American companies can be sold without tariff charges. And they can be shipped to other parts of the Empire at rates lower than those imposed on cars manufactured in the United States.

The war was a tremendous stimulus to Canadian industrial activity. The Ministry of Munitions and Supply expended \$12,-751,000,000 for contracts and plant expansion. With a population smaller than that of New York, this nation became an arsenal which turned out vast quantities of war supplies, including 16,200 aircraft and 8,000 ships. Canada has long engaged in active international trading. Some 22% of her prewar income was derived from exports, and 26% went to pay for imports. In this trade, the United States took over 40% of the exports and provided over 78% of the imports. The economy of Canada is thus very closely related to that of the United States.

Constitutional Growth. Britain acquired Canada from France in 1763, and for the next hundred years the British and the French peoples lived under separate local governments. Dominion disunity was reduced as a result of the Durham Report, but modern Canada came into existence with the British North America Act of 1867. This Act serves very much as a written constitution, establishing a federal system of government for all of Canada. The legislative, executive, and judicial processes are defined for both the Dominion and the Provincial governments. In contrast to the American Constitution, the British North America Act defines specifically the powers of the Provinces, leaving the residual powers with the central government at Ottawa.

In recent years there has been growing dissatisfaction with the original allocation of powers in the Act of 1867. All matters of property and civil rights, for example, are in the hands of the

Provinces. With the growing integration of the national economy, however, problems of social welfare have demanded action on a Dominion-wide basis. In 1934 a series of measures was passed at Ottawa relating to minimum wages, unemployment compensation, farm credit, hours of work, and the marketing of exports. On appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, these bills were held to usurp the powers of the Provinces under the British North America Act. In 1940 the Act was amended—at the request of the Canadian Parliament—to permit the Dominion to establish a system of unemployment insurance. During the war the Provinces granted certain emergency rights of taxation and other powers to the Dominion Government, but this was a temporary compromise. The Provinces are jealous of their present authority. Yet social legislation is demanded on the Dominion level. A general constitutional revision of the Canadian federal structure is thus a pressing postwar need, but at the same time it is an extremely delicate political problem.⁶

The Federal System. The King is represented in Canada by a Governor-General, whose role as agent of the Crown is nominal and ceremonial. The real executive is the Prime Minister, leader of the majority party of the lower chamber, the House of Commons. The House has a membership of 245, with representation on a proportionate basis to population, except for the Province of Quebec. This Province is given 65 members in the House, and representation for the other Provinces is based upon quotas arrived at by dividing the population of Quebec by 65. This gives Canadians a representative for every 50,000 persons at the present time.

Following the British procedure, a General Election is authorized every five years. Voting will occur oftener if a Cabinet suffers defeat in the Commons. Cabinet responsibility is the same as it is in England. The role of the House in legislation is much the same as in the British Parliament, with the important exception that local affairs are under the jurisdiction of the Provincial legislatures.⁷

⁶ A recent account of this constitutional issue is in H. McD. Clokie, *Canadian Government and Politics* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1944), Ch. VII.

⁷ While the United Kingdom is essentially a unitary government, it should be remarked that Northern Ireland, under the Irish Home Rule Bill of 1920, enjoys virtual federal status. It has a Governor appointed by the Crown, a Prime Minister, a bicameral Parliament consisting of 26 Senators and 52 Members of the House of Commons. It is empowered to deal with local policy matters with great freedom.

The Senate consists of 96 members appointed for life, and chosen in such a manner as to give adequate representation to each Province. Appointment is by the Crown, but on the advice of the Dominion Government. The Senate has the power to originate legislation other than measures calling for public expenditure. Technically the Senate may delay, amend, or defeat legislation, but this power is kept pretty much in abeyance. Abuse of its authority could very easily result in the elimination of the Senate from the Parliamentary picture by the simple amendment of the British North America Act.

Political Parties. Canada long functioned in the two-party tradition, but in the period following World War I a number of additional parties appeared, and have established themselves firmly in the Western Provinces. Until recently, however, the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives were the principal rivals in national affairs. Prime Minister Mackenzie King, Liberal leader, has led the government for 21 of the last 27 years, his term being interrupted by a Conservative majority during five of the depression years.

The programs of the two older parties are as generalized and as difficult to distinguish as is the case with the Democratic and Republican parties of the United States. Continuing party organization and activity is chiefly carried on in the Provinces, and the party programs in local affairs may vary widely in different parts of Canada. Thus there are liberals and conservatives in both parties, regardless of the labels. The Liberal Party has advocated low tariffs, and has sought to keep government intervention in the national economy at a minimum. Nevertheless the impact of the depression and of war has led the King government to attempt in many ways to organize and strengthen the economy through Dominion policy. The Progressive Conservatives have advanced a program of higher tariffs, and during the war were active in censuring the government on the grounds that it was not sufficiently energetic on behalf of the war effort.

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, or CCF, was organized in 1932. Representing labor, farmer, and socialist elements, it advocates the establishment of a planned state economy with a broad program of nationalization and social insurance. It was founded by a pacifist, but its leadership during the war gave active support to Canada's part in the conflict. The only other party of significance in Canadian affairs is the Social Credit Party,

created in 1935 and in control in Alberta. It is strongly opposed to the CCF, and advances its own monetary system of social credit as the ideal for the nation.

A General Election was held in June of 1945, and a vigorous campaign was waged by the 964 candidates nominated to the House of Commons. The Liberals lost in relative strength, but emerged with a small majority, although with only 35% of the popular vote. The Progressive Conservatives polled 26% of the total vote and were second in the number of seats gained. The CCF was a poor third in representation, but it won a significant 32% of the total popular vote. Of the 245 seats, the Liberals dropped from 161 to 118; the Progressive Conservatives went from 39 to 66; the CCF rose from 10 to 28; and the Social Credit Party had a slight increase from 10 to 13. The Liberals were far from secure, and the strong popular showing of the CCF made each by-election a critical one. Canada was not ready to embark upon the socialist program of Great Britain, but it was not strongly averse to such a solution to its problems if other policies did not prove satisfactory.

Provincial and Local Government. Each of the nine Provinces has its own Parliament and system of Cabinet government. In Quebec the legislature is bicameral; the other eight Provinces have unicameral assemblies. Representatives are elected for four- or five-year terms by general adult franchise. The Parliaments have complete authority within the framework of the powers granted them by the British North America Act. The Dominion is represented, however, by a Lieutenant-Governor which it appoints to each Province. Local government varies widely, but in general follows the English principle of appointed professional administrators responsible to elected councils.

AUSTRALIA

The People and the Economy. The 7,400,000 inhabitants of the Commonwealth of Australia live in a vast territory of 2,974,581 square miles, about the size of the United States. Much of the tropical area of the country is unsuitable for settlement, while parts of the interior are extremely arid. The bulk of the population is located in the temperate areas in the southeast, with almost half of the people residing in the six State Capitals of

Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth, and Hobart. The people are almost entirely of British stock, with a slight admixture of other Europeans, and about 60,000 aborigines. The country is prosperous and considerable additional settlement is possible. Immigration, however, is highly selective, and is restricted entirely to whites. Located close to the teeming and impoverished areas of Southeast Asia, Australia is determined to protect its high standard of living from any dilution through an influx of low-paid native workers. As a land of recent white settlement, Australia has a kind of frontier democracy which has abolished class distinctions and almost all of the other aspects of aristocracy.

Before the war the Australian economy was very much associated with the production of wool and wheat. Industrial trends were greatly accelerated by the demands for military supplies. Factory employment rose during the war to over 700,000, with the production of manufactured goods exceeding two billion dollars annually.

Government of the Commonwealth. Settlement of Australia began early in the nineteenth century with the colonization of Van Diemen's Land, now Tasmania. Separate colonies were established on the mainland in succeeding decades. A measure of autonomy was obtained by New South Wales in 1842, and in 1855 the system of "responsible government" was extended to other States. Federation under a Commonwealth Constitution came in 1901, and the government now includes the six States of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania, Queensland, and Western Australia, as well as two Territories and a few island Mandates.

The Constitution-makers of Australia had the historic examples of Canada and the United States to assist them. Like those two governments, the Australian problem was to superimpose a new central structure upon the already existing State units. After careful consideration, the American type of federalism was chosen, in which the delegated powers are given to the Federal government and the residual powers remain with the States. However, the enumeration of powers granted to the Federal government was more comprehensive than that in the United States. It included, for example, the complete regulation of marriage and divorce.

The Australian Constitution followed the British system in

setting up the agencies charged with the formulation and administration of public policy. A Prime Minister heads a Cabinet responsible to the lower chamber. This House of Representatives is based upon universal suffrage, and its 74 members are chosen from the various States in proportion to population. The Senate, on the other hand, consists of six Senators who are elected from each of the States for six-year terms, renewable by halves every three years.

After meeting with the approval of the several States, the Constitution was established in 1900 following approval by the British Parliament. Unlike the Canadian situation, where constitutional change requires amendment of the British North America Act, the Australians may modify their own Constitution without turning to Britain. Amendments require a majority in each house of Parliament, followed by approval of the voters in a majority of the States. Despite the ease with which amendments may be submitted, Constitutional change in Australia has been conservative.⁸

Political Parties. The Australian Labor Party is the strongest national organization. It was headed by Prime Minister John Curtin, who took office after the elections of 1941, until his death in 1945. Since that time the Cabinet has been led by Joseph B. Chifley. The opposition groups have had much difficulty in maintaining unity, and since 1944 have been headed by the Liberal Party of Australia, which was formed under the leadership of former Prime Minister Robert Gordon Menzies. The once influential Country Party is of currently waning importance, losing much of the small farmer vote to the forces of Labor.

With 22 votes in the Senate and 49 in the House, the Laborites had a clear majority at the close of World War II. State ownership of basic utilities is extensive, and Australian Labor supports a program of further nationalization, accompanied by a broad system of social insurance. A notable achievement of the Government has been the minimization of industrial strife through the creation of a Commonwealth Court of Arbitration and Conciliation to deal with the regulation of hours and conditions of work, and with wage issues.

⁸ The political growth of Australia is well presented in Ernest Scott, *A Short History of Australia* (London: Oxford University Press, 1936). A review of the American influence on the Constitution is in Erling M. Hunt, *American Precedents in Australian Federation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930).

NEW ZEALAND

Twelve hundred miles east of Australia lie the islands of New Zealand. With an area of 103,934 square miles, this Dominion has a population of 1,750,000, the smallest of any of the Commonwealth members. About 93,000 are Maoris, the rest are whites. Settlement of New Zealand occurred during the same period as that of Australia. Representative government was extended to New Zealand in 1852, and the country obtained Dominion status in 1907.

New Zealand's Parliament follows the usual British plan of a Prime Minister and Cabinet responsible to an elective lower chamber, the House of Representatives. The 80 members of this House are chosen for terms of three years. Representation favors the rural sections by a special quota advantage which has ranged from 28% down to 18% in recent years. The upper chamber is a Legislative Council of 36 members, appointed for seven years by the Governor General on the advice of the Cabinet. The proceedings of Parliament have been broadcast since 1936.

Since 1935 New Zealand has had a Labor government, first under J. M. Savage, and later under Peter Fraser. The 1946 election continued Labor in power, although with a reduced majority.

This Dominion is widely known for its pioneering in the field of social legislation. As early as 1898 it adopted an old-age pension law, and in subsequent years it has steadily expanded the nature and amount of benefits in its insurance scheme. The Social Security Act of 1938 covered medical, hospital, old age, widows', orphans', invalidity, family, and unemployment benefits. To these the Government has recently added free ambulance service and publicly financed dental care for children. The Bank of New Zealand has been nationalized, and public utilities are under Government ownership. It is proposed to provide every home and factory with electricity. The wartime inflation-control program worked well, keeping the cost of living to about a third that of the United States. A national labor relations program involves Labor Courts and public provision of the 40-hour week, minimum wages, and even compulsory unionization of some industries.

SOUTH AFRICA

Constitutional Development. The Union of South Africa is made up of four Provinces: The Cape of Good Hope, Natal, the Transvaal, and the Orange Free State. The Mandate of South-West Africa (formerly German) has since 1925 been administered as an integral part of the Union, although without Parliamentary representation. In the Union area of 472,550 square miles is a population of 11,250,000, of whom about 2,300,000 are whites of European stock; almost 300,000 are Asiatics, mostly Indians; and the balance are native Negroes or mixed colored peoples.

Cape Colony was founded by the Dutch, but became British in 1814 in return for financial aid to the Netherlands Government. To maintain their traditional patriarchal way of life free from interference, the Boers made the "Great Trek" into the interior Provinces. The British seized Natal in 1843, but in the 1850's both the Transvaal and the Orange Free State were recognized as independent republics. The development of the Kimberley diamond fields on the borders of these states led to friction. The Transvaal was annexed by the British in 1877, but the Boers regained their independence in 1881. Opening of the great gold fields near Johannesburg in 1886 brought in numbers of British and other Europeans, who were resented by the Boers as "Uitlanders." The newcomers were heavily taxed and were denied political rights. Cecil Rhodes, active in the growth of British power, attempted to stimulate an uprising, but this was quickly crushed. By the end of the century, animosities had increased to the point where the Chamberlain Government issued an ultimatum resulting in the Boer War of 1899. This three-year conflict was costly to England in money, lives, and world respect. After the Peace of Vereeniging in 1902, a policy of reconciliation began in London which was pressed most vigorously by the Liberals after they formed a Government in 1905. The considerable expense of this program was borne by the British, and in 1909 Parliament passed the South African Act, creating the Union and placing it on a virtual Dominion footing. The first Prime Minister of the newly unified country was Louis Botha, who had commanded the Boer army during the war.

Although the Union of South Africa entered World War I on the side of the Allies, opposition was so strong on the part of the

Boers that it led to an uprising in 1914. During and after the war the Boer Nationalists, led by General Hertzog, sought a restoration of independence for the two former republics, but were successfully blocked by Prime Minister Botha. When Botha died, Jan Christian Smuts, another former Boer general, who served as Commander in British East Africa in 1916-17, became head of the Government and chief of the South African Party, which stood for continued unity with Britain.

The Nationalist leader, General Hertzog, became Premier in 1924 and continued in that capacity until 1939. He established Afrikaans as an official state language, but modified his demands for political nationalism because of dependence upon support of the Labor Party. The Laborites, on the other hand, gave up much of their Socialism in order to join the coalition with the Nationalists. They had turned strongly against Smuts in 1922 when he ruthlessly repressed the strikes occurring in that depression year. By 1931, however, Labor had withdrawn from the Hertzog Government.

The Statute of Westminster in 1931 confirmed the Union's Dominion status. In 1935 the South African Party and the Nationalists reconciled their differences and joined forces under Hertzog and Smuts. In 1939, however, Hertzog again stood in opposition to support of Britain in war. He made a strong plea for neutrality before the Parliament, but was opposed by Smuts. In a historic division the Assembly voted for war by 80 to 67. After this victory, Smuts became Premier. Possible efforts at revolution were forestalled by the pleas of Hertzog and other Nationalist leaders to abide by Constitutional procedures. There were occasional incidents, however, involving pro-Fascist extremists who were quite numerous in some parts of the Union. Despite the precarious beginning of the war effort, Smuts led the national mobilization, and South Africa made a remarkable contribution to the United Nations cause, both in terms of supplies and of military personnel. In the 1943 elections the Smuts Government won 107 seats to only 43 for Malan, leading the Nationalists after Hertzog's death.

South Africa has a Parliament consisting of a Senate, whose members are chosen for ten-year terms, and a House of Assembly, with members elected for five years. The Constitution provides that all Members of Parliament must be persons "of European descent," thus ensuring an all-white legislature. Of the 40 Sena-

tors, eight are selected by the Legislative Council of each Province, and eight by the Governor-General on the advice of the Cabinet. Among the eight appointed by the Governor-General are four "Representatives of the Natives." These are whites who have "thorough acquaintance with the reasonable wants and wishes of the colored races."

In the Assembly there are 153 members, of whom three are Representatives of the Natives, chosen from Cape Province in a separate election by those colored persons who can meet the necessary property qualifications. Whites do not have such requirements. Negroes do not participate in Parliamentary elections in any way in the other Provinces. In 1945 added representation was given to the Asiatics with two Senators, one nominated by the Governor-General and one elected by the Indians. Indians are also to choose three members of the Assembly, in separate balloting. Again, however, the Representatives of the Indians must be of European descent.

The Provinces have little inherent power. All laws enacted by the Provincial Councils must receive the approval of the Pretorian Government, while additional functions may be delegated to the Provinces by the central authority. Fundamentally, South Africa is a unitary system in Federal garb. Each Province is organized with an administrator appointed by the Governor-General on the advice of the Cabinet, and an elective legislative council.

Race and Politics in South Africa. Nowhere is the race question more acute than in this part of the world—not even in the American South. In the United States, with the exception of Mississippi, whites outnumber the Negroes in every state. In South Africa the whites make up about 20 per cent of the population. To maintain their political and economic power, the European group has enacted numerous laws providing for segregation and electoral disqualification of the other races. The few Negroes and Indians who do participate in the government are required to vote only for whites in the Parliamentary elections. A policy of land reserves is being extended and will ultimately place the bulk of the natives on about 12 per cent of the land in a manner somewhat akin to the American system of Indian reservations. A pass system subjects the natives to rigid control in moving from one place to another in the Union, and in employment. Moreover, an annual head tax of four dollars is levied, and

natives found without receipts may be compelled to work in the mines or on farms to pay the tax.

Extension of the color bar to Asiatics, most of whom are East Indians or their descendants, has on occasion stirred up international animosities. This occurred in 1924, when Smuts attempted to repatriate the Asiatics, and, failing this, segregated them into "class areas." Protests from the Indian Government ended this, but disabilities of the Asiatics were again increased in 1944. While modest indirect political representation was granted in 1946, the Indians continued to be restricted as to areas where they could own and occupy property.

At the United Nations Conference on International Organization in 1945, Marshal Smuts was the principal author of the stirring preamble to the United Nations Charter, in which much is made of the "determination" of "the peoples of the United Nations" to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women . . ." and "to practice tolerance. . . ." Yet in the 1946 meetings of the United Nations Assembly, the South Africans attempted to prevent any discussion of their race policies on the grounds that these were purely domestic matters. Only the skillful and persuasive efforts of India's woman delegate, Madame Pandit, brought to the floor the question of the discrimination practiced in South Africa against the Indian minority. Delicate as it was, the matter was temporarily settled by a vote of 32 to 15 directing South Africa to conform to the United Nations Charter, and requesting both governments to settle their differences and to report the results to the Assembly. This was a vigorous step in strengthening United Nations authority, for it stands as a precedent suggesting that the traditional unilateral determination of what constitutes "domestic questions" must give way to a more general decision as to what matters affect the peace and security of the world.

South Africa's race problems will not yield easily to solution. The fact of native unreadiness for political democracy is inescapable. Not only are these millions unacquainted with the institutions of government of Western civilization, but in their own affairs they have a cultural history of primitive but nonetheless very real absolutism. Moreover, it is one thing for a nation to prepare dependent peoples for freedom, as in the case of the Philippines, and it is an entirely different thing to anticipate

ultimate domination by the presently subordinate majorities. At present, no political party in South Africa stands for any real modification of racial restrictions.⁹

Abstract principles and hard facts are here in dramatic opposition. Yet the situation cannot remain static. Nationalist sentiment is increasing among the dependent peoples of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa. India, much concerned with the South African situation, is obtaining a position of equality in the family of nations. The United Nations is in part dedicated to the task of promoting "human rights and fundamental freedoms for all." These things point to continuing pressure on South Africa to modify its policies in keeping with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter.

EIRE

Growth of the Republic. The story of the Irish people is an epic of triumph and tragedy. St. Patrick brought Christianity to the island from Rome in the fifth century. The work of this great Churchman and his successor, St. Columba, rooted the Catholic faith firmly and permanently in the social structure. The security of the Church in this land during the period of barbarism following the fall of Rome made Ireland a center of Western culture in the period from 500 to 800. The early political atomism of the clans under their numerous monarchs was reduced to a certain unity in the third century under the chief kings residing at Tara, near what is now Dublin. Periodically great assemblies gathered at Tara to deal with legislative matters, and for feasting and revelry as well. The lawmaking body was called the "dal" and it is from this ancient prototype that the lower house of the modern Irish Parliament gets its name of Dáil.

For five centuries Tara was the meeting place of the leading clans, but in the sixth century this chapter came to a close when

⁹ Brazil is sometimes cited in this connection as a nation with a heterogeneous ethnic composition where there is no race question simply because it has never been permitted to develop by law or custom. This is no assistance in the practical problem of modifying an existing system where power is in the hands of a white minority possessing strong sentiments of racial superiority, and where a system of political equality would reduce the whites to a secondary position in a country they have been instrumental in developing.

King Dermot violated the sanctuary of a church to capture an accused murderer. In retaliation for such a grave sacrilege, Bishop Ruadan excommunicated the King and pronounced the legendary curse: "Desolate be Tara, forever and ever!" This destroyed the power of the chief king, and the meetings at Tara were ended. Today the ancient castle is rubble. "The Harp that once through Tara's halls the soul of music shed" has long been still, but it has resounded in memory as the people have sought to regain their ancient freedom.

Britain's role in the Emerald Isle began with the conquest under Henry II in the twelfth century. English rule was never fully accepted, and when Henry VIII broke with the Roman Church, the breach with the Irish people was widened. In the seventeenth century the northern part of the island was occupied by English and Scottish settlers, and this influx of Protestants transferred the religious and political schism to Ireland itself.

Two great uprisings in the course of the seventeenth century were crushed by the British, with the imposition of severe penalties. By the end of the eighteenth century, however, Ireland had regained a considerable amount of autonomy. The example of the French Revolution inspired an effort in 1798 to obtain complete independence, but this failed once more. As a result, an Act of Union in 1801 abolished the Irish legislature and gave the people direct representation in the British Parliament. The fight for Home Rule was revived under the leadership of Daniel O'Connell in 1840. The movement gained such support that Gladstone finally attempted to give it expression. Two Home Rule bills which he championed were defeated, although the second passed the Commons.

Another bill for Irish Home Rule passed the Commons in 1912 and was held up by the Lords under the powers they retained under the Parliament Act of 1911. In 1914, however, the House of Commons gave the bill final passage despite the opposition of the upper chamber. World War I led to an informal agreement among most of those associated with the matter to defer application of the act until the termination of hostilities. This was too much for the extremists in Ireland, and the Sinn Fein (ourselves alone) Party attracted a host of belligerent supporters for its program of immediate and unqualified independence.

A premature rebellion in 1916 was subdued, and some of its leaders were executed. Eamon de Valera was one of those sen-

tenced to death, but his American citizenship—he was born in New York City—led to commutation of the sentence to life imprisonment. He was released by the general amnesty of 1917, and, as one of the few militant republican leaders left, was promptly chosen to head the Sinn Fein. In 1918 he was again imprisoned, but made an almost unbelievably dramatic escape, ultimately returning to America for a time. He returned to Ireland in 1919 and in the election of that year became President of the Dáil, which was made up of the Sinn Fein members who had officially been elected to the House of Commons. Instead of going to London, however, they assembled in Dublin and proclaimed a republic. This led to vicious civil war, with the infamous Black-and-Tans and Irish nationalists locked in bloody combat.

A Home Rule Bill was enacted by the British in 1920, providing for separate Parliaments in the two sections of Ireland. In the North, the voters of Ulster accepted the proposal and their new government was quickly set up within the framework of the United Kingdom. Catholic Ireland rejected the proffered solution and continued to support the rebels, recognizing only the laws and judgments of the Parliament and Courts of the "Republic." Finally a compromise was reached and a treaty was negotiated in 1921. This was ratified by the British Parliament and by the Irish Assembly, and pursuant to its provisions a Constitution for the Free State of Ireland was framed and adopted in 1922. De Valera refused to accept this Dominion relationship, however, and split with the moderates among his own people. This provoked a renewal of civil war, which continued until the Spring of 1923, when it was terminated by the exhaustion of both sides. Not until 1927, however, did de Valera and his followers deign to enter the Dáil. He became President in 1932, and this was confirmed by an election in 1933.

Under de Valera's leadership, Ireland became increasingly independent. The oath of allegiance to the King was abolished, and the power of the Governor-General restricted. Appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were prohibited. Finally in 1937 a new Constitution was prepared and approved by the people, without reference to England or the terms of the Treaty of 1921. The Irish Republic is today free and without binding political restraints from any external source. Her neutrality in World War II was a defiant and no doubt self-satisfying

evidence of her legal right to go it alone under stress in world affairs.

The Government of Eire. Although still regarded as a Dominion in British policy, the Government of Ireland holds itself a Republic associated with the British Commonwealth. There is today no Governor-General symbolic of the tie with Britain, but instead the people elect a President to conduct the formalities of public affairs. He summons and dissolves the legislature, signs and promulgates the laws, and, on nomination of the Dáil, appoints the Prime Minister. He may refer certain bills to the Supreme Court to ascertain whether or not they are in conflict with the Constitution, and under certain circumstances may submit bills to the people for a referendum. He is supreme commander of the defense forces, exercising this power under directive laws.

The Parliament is bicameral, with 138 deputies elected to the Dáil for five-year terms. The Hare system of proportional representation is used to ensure distribution of seats to the political parties in accordance with their actual electoral strength.¹⁰ The upper chamber is composed of 60 Senators, with ten-year terms. Six are elected by the National and Dublin Universities, and eleven are nominated by the Prime Minister. The remaining 43 are chosen on a vocational basis by an electoral college of 365 members. This body is made up of the 138 Dáil deputies, together with seven members from each of the 31 county and county-borough councils.

The vocational members of the Senate are drawn from five panels: (1) National Language and Culture, Literature, Art, Education, and related professional interests; (2) Agriculture and allied activities, and Fisheries; (3) Labor, both organized and unorganized; (4) Industry and Commerce, including banking, finance, accountancy, engineering, and architecture; and (5) Public Administration and Social Services. The system is complicated, experimental, and in process of adjustment, but it is significant as a democratic effort to justify a second chamber on a functional basis rather than as a body representing a superior

¹⁰ For a description of this method of voting, which is used in New York City and other American municipalities, see George H. Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*, rev. ed. (Washington: National Home Library Foundation, 1940). A broad survey of this method of voting is in Clarence G. Hoag and George H. Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1929).

class, or as an agency which more or less duplicates the composition of the lower house.¹¹ The Senate plays a distinctly secondary role, since it cannot veto legislative proposals which have been approved by the Dáil.

The three million inhabitants of Eire enjoy a substantial program of social protection, stemming from broad provisions of the constitution. Civil rights are guaranteed, including religious liberty, although the special position of the Catholic Church is recognized as guardian of the faith of the majority of citizens. Going beyond the more usual emphasis upon individual rights, the fundamental law of Ireland provides in Article 41: "The State recognizes the Family as the natural primary and fundamental unit group of Society and as a moral institution possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights, antecedent and superior to all positive law."

Authoritative guidance in welfare matters is provided by Article 45, entitled "Directive Principles of Social Policy." While the right to private property is honored, it is to be distributed in such a manner as subserves the common good, and is "to be regulated by the principles of social justice." Credit is to be controlled to advance the welfare of the people, and "the operation of free competition shall not be allowed so to develop as to result in the concentration of the ownership of control of essential commodities in a few individuals to the common detriment." So far as possible, families are to be settled in economic security on the land, and all citizens are to be given the right to an adequate means of livelihood. When necessary, the State is to provide needed care for the infirm, the widow, the orphan, and the aged, and provision is to be made so that citizens are not compelled by economic necessity to enter occupations unsuited to their sex, age, or strength.¹²

It is in these provisions that the Roman Catholic influence on Irish political philosophy is most evident. They seek to embody in a practical way the ideas of such great encyclicals as *Rerum Novarum* (The Condition of the Working Classes) and

¹¹ An excellent study of the formation and early work of this branch of the Irish Parliament is by Arthur W., and Mary C. Bromage, "The Vocational Senate in Ireland," *American Political Science Review*, XXIV, No. 3 (June, 1940), pp. 519-538.

¹² The salient portions of the Irish Constitution in the field of social policy are in Michael Oakshott, *The Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe* (New York: The Macmillan Co., American Edition, 1942), pp. 72-77.

Quadragesimo Anno (On the Reconstruction of the Social Order).¹³ In the latter, Pope Pius XI rebuked the extremists on the side of both capital and labor, and said "Now this is the primary duty of the State and of all good citizens: to abolish conflict between classes with divergent interests, and thus foster and promote harmony between the 'vocational groups.'" The precepts of social justice outlined in *Quadragesimo Anno* are the foundations of the Irish ideal. Realization of such a program, however, requires general prosperity, and this in turn ties Ireland to England and the Commonwealth by the necessities of trade.

Irish political leadership is in de Valera's Fianna Fail Party, which in 1944 won 76 of the 138 seats in the Dáil. The Fine Gael, or United Ireland Party, won 30 seats, and the Clann Na Talmhan, or Farmers' Party, obtained 12. The two leading parties favor continued association with Britain, but also seek a union of all Ireland under one government. That this issue is important in current relations with Britain was indicated in an address by de Valera in reply to an attack by Winston Churchill on May 13, 1945. Churchill, reviewing the course of the war, said that only through the cooperation of Northern Ireland was it realistically possible for Britain to withhold its hand and let "the de Valera government . . . frolic with the Germans and later with the Japanese representatives to their hearts' content." The Irish Premier answered on May 16, and said that as a "partitioned small nation" it was too much to expect the Irish to join in a crusade on the same side as the partitioning power. "Mr. Churchill is justly proud of his nation's perseverance against heavy odds," de Valera remarked, "but we in this island are still prouder of our people's perseverance for freedom through all the centuries."

INDIA

The Peoples of the Peninsula. Jutting down from the great land mass of Asia is Britain's most populous member of Empire, India. In an area somewhat over half the size of the United States live almost 400 million people, a fifth of the human race. India has a varied racial composition, the result of successive invasions over thousands of years, and her people speak a wide

¹³ The Latin title of each encyclical comes from its opening words; the English title reveals its subject matter.

range of languages. For political purposes, Indians are classified not geographically or racially, but principally in accordance with their religions.

On this basis the largest group consists of the 260 million Hindus. However, this religious community is by no means unified. Originally Hinduism had four castes—the Brahmin—(priest), Kashatriya (soldier), Vaisya (merchant), and Sudra (laborer). In the course of time this system has become intricately complicated, so that there are now well over 2,000 castes and sub-castes. Orthodox members of a caste may not intermarry with persons outside their own caste, or even eat with them. Outside the castes, at the bottom of the Hindu hierarchy, are the 50 million pariahs, or untouchables, who must engage only in menial work, and who are so little regarded that even their shadows are believed to pollute the food of the higher castes. Orthodox Hinduism also holds that a man must be born into the faith; conversion is impossible. However there are a few modern sects of a proselyting character. While millions of idols are part of the religion, fundamentally these are regarded as variants of Brahma, the One Spirit which gives life in the universe.

The second great religious community is Moslem, adhering to the teachings of Mohammed in a system termed Islam.¹⁴ Moslems believe that Mohammed, who died in 632 A. D., was a prophet in direct line of descent from Abraham, and ranking equally with Moses and Christ as expounder of the faith. All persons in Islam must acknowledge belief in Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed. As this link with the Jewish and Christian faiths would suggest, Mohammedanism is strictly monotheistic. Moreover, within the brotherhood of Islam there are no distinctions of race or class, for all believers are socially and legally equal. The greater part of the 93 million Moslems are in the northeastern and northwestern Provinces, where they are the majority.

There are about six million Sikhs, chiefly in the Punjab. This group is an offshoot of Hinduism, but it rejects caste and idolatry. In the eighteenth century the Sikh leader Gobind Singh developed his followers into a military community, and the Sikhs have subsequently maintained a reputation of skill in war. From their ranks come the regiments which form the backbone of the In-

¹⁴ Islam means "Surrender"—to God.

dian Army. India also has about six million Christians, many of them untouchables converted from a faith which gave them only a place of dismal oppression. There are a million and a half Jains, closely associated with the Hindus; a half-million Buddhists; and something over a hundred thousand Parsees, who follow Zoroastrianism, and who are extremely influential in Indian industrial and professional life in cooperation with the Hindus. The other millions of Indians follow ancient tribal religions classed as Animistic faiths.

Indian independence has been slow in coming to fruition for many reasons, but chiefly because of a lack of internal political homogeneity among the people. There are but 58 cities of over 100,000 population and the largest, Calcutta, has about two million. In the 600,000 villages the people live in simple agricultural isolation, often on the margin—or over the brink—of famine. The demand for independence is largely an urban agitation fostered by the educated classes. The gulf between Hindu and Moslem is wide and deep. It is well known that Hindus regard cows as sacred, and Moslems abhor pigs, but unfortunately the differences between these communities cannot be simplified to an issue of beef versus pork. The Hindus have numerical superiority and have taken more readily to modern education and technical training, and consequently have obtained more than a proportionate share of governmental posts. They have provided the active leadership in industry and banking and in these fields maintain close economic ties with British capitalists.¹⁵ Moslem demand for an independent state of Pakistan is based not only on religious antagonism, but on fear that they will not have their proper share of political and economic power in a united India.

The modern political structure of India has been organized on a dual division between British India and the Native States. British India covers 865,000 square miles and embraces some 300 million people. The other 716,000 square miles and nearly 100 million inhabitants are governed through 562 Princely

¹⁵ India's "big five" in the economic field strongly support the Congress Party. They are (1) the Birla brothers, with holdings in banking, textiles, and jute; (2) the Singhanian brothers, controlling numerous enterprises in steel, chemicals, textiles, insurance, and banking; (3) S. R. Dalmia, active in banking, coal, and sugar; (4) the Tata family, leading in steel, air lines, and textiles; and (5) the Herachant family, controlling the shipping industry and influential in other fields of transportation. The Tatas and Herachants are Parsees, the others are Hindus.

States. These range from areas of a few miles to the giants of Hyderabad, as large as France and with over 16 million people, and Rajputana with over 14 million.¹⁶ British India has been ruled directly. Relations with the Native States have been by treaty, with the British controlling external affairs, but granting considerable autonomy in local administration.

British Rule in India. The British East India Company was chartered under Elizabeth in 1600, and in the heyday of British expansion established itself in the Indian areas formerly occupied by Portugal. In the eighteenth century the French East India Company attempted to seek support from Indian leaders to expel the British. The English company resorted to the same tactics, under the leadership of Robert Clive, and the French were ejected after the Battle of Plassey in 1757. In 1772 Warren Hastings became Governor of Bengal, and in 1774 he was made the first Governor-General of India.

The conversion of the East India Company from trading to politics was recognized by the creation of a Board of Control in London in 1784 to maintain liaison between Parliament and the Company's affairs. In 1833 the Company became completely responsible to Parliament for Indian government. At the same time some participation of Indians in administration was authorized, and Lord Macaulay, supporting the plan in Parliament, made his famous prophecy: "It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown the system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may in some future age demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history."

British India continued to grow, sometimes peacefully, and often to the accompaniment of bloodshed. Resentment toward European rule led to a major flareup in the famous Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. Though this was finally quelled after brutal fighting, its effect on home opinion was such that the East India Company's charter was canceled and its authority taken over by the British Crown the next year. Queen Victoria proclaimed

¹⁶ Travancore has always been a major Princely State, but it has acquired world significance as the principal source of thorium, a fissionable material.

her assumption of the Government of India and a new era of English rule began.

The subsequent history of India to World War II has been marked by the slow expansion of Indian participation in government. In 1861 Parliament provided for Indian representation on the Central Legislative Council under the Viceroy, and in the Provincial Councils of Bombay and Madras. The Central Legislative Council and the Provincial Councils were enlarged in 1892, with a beginning of indirect election for some members. The Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 gave up the official British majority in the Provincial Councils, and added to these assemblies a number of members who were mostly chosen by indirect elections. At this time the issue between Hindus and Moslems was settled by providing for separate electoral constituencies for each group. This policy has been followed ever since, and while it was a method of minimizing direct political clashes, it served to emphasize and maintain the separatism of the two religious communities in political matters. These reforms also increased the Viceroy's Legislative Council by adding 60 members, of whom 27 were elected, 6 of these being Moslems chosen by their own community.

The changes thus instituted were insufficient to mollify the Indian leaders, and pressure was maintained for additional rights. In 1917, Edwin Montagu, Secretary of State for India, announced that British policy envisioned "the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the Empire." No action was taken in Parliament, however, until the incident of 1919 when General Dyer went to extremes in repressing rioting in Amritsar, even to the point of ordering Indians to crawl on their hands and knees through certain streets of this city sacred to the Sikhs.

The Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms embodied in the Government of India Act of 1919 gave a degree of responsible government to the Provinces. The Preamble to the Act reiterated the Montagu pronouncement of 1917 and indicated that the new scheme was a "substantial step" in the "successive stages" by which self-government was to be developed. A system of "dyarchy" was set up in the 1919 reforms, under which Indian Ministers in the Provinces were given responsibility for certain

administrative matters, while the Executive Councils were in charge of "reserved" subjects. A majority of the Provincial Legislative Councils were placed on an elective basis with a popular franchise. The Central Legislature of India was converted to a bicameral organization consisting of a Council of State and a Legislative Assembly, with a majority of the members of each house elected. Ultimate British authority was retained, however, through the proviso that matters rejected by the Central or Provincial Legislatures could be made law by decree of the Viceroy or the Provincial Governors, if the measure was deemed "essential for the safety, tranquillity or interests of British India."

This plan was to have a ten-year trial. Meanwhile the Indian National Congress became a vital factor in the picture under the leadership of Mohandas K. Gandhi. He was a product of the Indian colony in South Africa, and received his advanced education in England. Living simply and emphasizing his rejection of the Western world by his famous garb of Indian homespun, Gandhi won widespread support among all classes for his program of political nonresistance. The civil disobedience he instigated led to prison terms for this man and many of his associates, but these tribulations only increased sympathy for him among the people. He won many concessions, and in cooperation with him the Indians in the various Legislative Assemblies blocked many measures, often matters of small importance, to compel the British representatives to use their decree powers and thus dramatize the extent of British authority.

In 1927 the Simon Commission was appointed to investigate Indian qualification for further self-rule. It worked conscientiously despite the handicap of Indian hostility to the idea of an all-British body passing political judgment on India. In 1929 the Viceroy announced on behalf of the government that Dominion Status was clearly embodied in the ultimate policy of Britain. This merely added fuel to the flames, and in 1930 the Congress Party declared India's independence and adopted a national flag. It issued a Declaration of Independence in the American tradition, indicting Britain in a lengthy bill of particulars. At about this time the Moslem League, under the leadership of Mahomed Ali Jinnah, began to press for Pakistan. The Congress maneuver was, of course, a gesture, but it was a formidable one. The Moslem League in its turn posed a growing threat to future unity.

Incidents and conferences alternated until in 1935 a Government of India Act was passed providing for the full Federation of British India, with optional participation for the Native States. An elaborate division of powers was worked out between the Central and Provincial Governments, and full responsibility was granted the Provinces within their sphere of competence. However, opposition to the bill was so great that its proposals for reorganization of the Central Government were never put into effect. The Government thus continues under a Viceroy, aided by an Executive Council. The Central Legislature consists of a Council of State of 60, with 34 elected and 26 nominated, of whom 13 are officials. The lower chamber is the Legislative Assembly of 142, with 102 elected and 40 nominated, 26 of these being officials. In the 1945 election the Congress Party won 56 seats in the Legislative Assembly and the Moslem League 30, with a scattering of other parties and independents.

The Provincial Governments were adjusted in conformance with the terms of the Act of 1935, despite the delay concerning the Central Government. Burma was separated from India, and British India was thereupon grouped into eleven Provinces. In 1937 the elections resulted in Congress Party victories in eight: Assam, Bihar, Bombay, Central Provinces, Madras, Northwest Frontier Province, Orissa, and the United Provinces. The non-Congress groups were victorious in Bengal, Punjab, and Sind, each of which chose a Moslem Prime Minister.

The Impact of War. When Britain took India into war in 1939, the Congress Party protested and its eight Provincial Ministries resigned, even though foreign policy and defense matters were out of the hands of the Provinces. To restore cooperation, the British in 1940 offered India full Dominion Status as soon as possible after the War, and made other proposals to implement the movement toward Indian constitutionalism. In 1941 the Viceroy expanded his Executive Council by adding five Indians as heads of departments, and more Indians were drawn into various other agencies of the Central Government.

The Churchill Government sent Sir Stafford Cripps to India in 1942 to seek Indian approval of a plan for a postwar elected Constituent Assembly based upon proportional representation of the Provinces and such Indian States as would decide to participate. The Indians continued to insist upon immediate control of the government, while the British would not concede this

point until the cessation of hostilities. When Cripps and Nehru failed to come to an agreement, the Congress Party called for another civil disobedience movement, and Gandhi and the other Congress leaders were again imprisoned. The Indian people gave some support to the war effort of Britain, but very much on the approach that it was the lesser of two evils. When Japan entered the war in 1941, expected aid from India did not materialize. Nehru, although in jail for his political opposition, nevertheless urged his followers to remain with Britain in the struggle, seeing that there would be no hope of independence under Fascism. At the same time the Indians were not stirred to enthusiastic sacrifice by remembering that Winston Churchill had led the Parliamentary opposition to the reforms of 1935, nor were they reassured by Churchill's remarks that he did not intend to preside over the liquidation of the Empire, or that the Atlantic Charter did not assure the independence of India.

Postwar Constitutionalism. Early in 1946 the Labor Government sent a mission composed of Lord Pethick-Lawrence, Sir Stafford Cripps, and A. V. Alexander, to India in an effort to bring together the leaders of the Congress Party and the Moslem League. After an unsuccessful conference at Simla, the mission made its own recommendations, which became the basis for a new British policy.¹⁷ The report rejected the Moslem proposal of Pakistan for several reasons, including: (1) the fact that it would not provide adequately for large non-Moslem majorities;¹⁸

¹⁷ *India (Cabinet Mission) Statement by the Cabinet Mission and His Excellency the Viceroy*, Cmd. 6821 (1946).

¹⁸ The last official census of 1941 showed the following distribution in the areas where the Moslems seek control:

Northwestern Area		Moslem	Non-Moslem
Punjab		16,217,242	12,201,577
Northwest Frontier Province		2,788,797	249,270
Sind		3,208,325	1,326,683
British Baluchistan		438,930	62,701
		<hr/> 22,653,294	<hr/> 13,840,231
		62.07%	37.93%
Northeastern Area			
Bengal		33,005,434	27,301,091
Assam		3,442,479	6,762,254
		<hr/> 36,447,913	<hr/> 34,063,345
		51.69%	48.31%

(2) it would disintegrate the India-wide economic, administrative, and military structure that had taken generations to create; (3) the two sections of the proposed State of Pakistan would be separated by seven hundred miles of Hindustani territory;¹⁹ and (4) the Native States would find it difficult to join in association with a divided India. On the other hand, the Congress proposal for extreme Provincial autonomy was rejected also, since it would result in a Central Government without sufficient power to carry out an adequate program of economic development for the country.

The new Constitution, then, was to embody the following features: "(1) There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the following subjects: foreign affairs, defence, and communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects; (2) The Union should have an executive and a legislature constituted from British Indian and States representatives. Any question raising a major communal issue in the legislature should require for its decision a majority of the representatives present and voting of each of the two major communities as well as a majority of all the members present and voting; (3) All subjects other than the Union subjects and all residuary powers should vest in the provinces; (4) The States will retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union; (5) Provinces should be free to form groups with executives and legislatures, and each group could determine the provincial subjects to be taken in common; (6) The constitutions of the Union and of the groups should contain a provision whereby any province could by a majority vote of its legislative assembly call for a reconsideration of the terms of the constitution after an initial period of ten years and at ten-year intervals thereafter."²⁰

The makeup of a constitutional assembly was outlined, in which there were to be three Sections. Section A included the representatives of the bulk of the Hindu Provinces; Section B the Provinces of the Northwest with Moslem majorities; and Section C the Moslem Provinces of the Northeast, Bengal and

¹⁹ Moslem leader Jinnah has proposed a "corridor" to join these distant parts of the Moslem State.

²⁰ *India (Cabinet Mission)*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

Assam. Within each Section, representation was set up under the headings General, Moslem, and Sikh (in Group B only). Thus in Section A, there were to be 167 General representatives and 20 Moslems; in Section B, 22 Moslems, 4 Sikhs, and 9 General; and in Section C, 36 Moslems and 34 General. This made a total for British India of 292, and the Indian States were invited to participate by sending up to 93 additional members. The full Assembly was thus to include 385 representatives, or close to 1 for each million persons.

The Cabinet Mission concluded its Report with these words: "We hope that the new independent India may choose to be a member of the British Commonwealth. We hope, in any event, that you will remain in close and friendly association with our people. But these are matters for your own free choice. Whatever that choice may be, we look forward with you to your ever-increasing prosperity among the greatest nations of the world and to a future even more glorious than your past."

A Constituent Assembly was set up along these lines at the end of 1946 and began its historic task. Each of the three Sections was to frame Constitutions for the Provinces it represented. All the Sections, together with the Indian State representatives, were to formulate the Union Constitution. Pending conclusion of the Assembly's work, an interim Cabinet was set up with Nehru as Premier, but with posts allocated to the Moslems. For a time the Moslems refused to participate, anticipating that this might cause the Government to collapse. The Cabinet appeared to function successfully, however, and the Moslems finally agreed to join.

RECENT TRENDS

At the beginning of July, 1947, the titles of the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs and the Dominions Office were altered to Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations and Commonwealth Relations Office. Prime Minister Attlee, in notifying the House of Commons of the changes, said that it was clear that in certain quarters the old titles were inappropriate and misleading as to the actual relations between the United Kingdom and the other members of the Commonwealth.

India. In the House of Commons, Indian affairs moved swiftly

in 1947. When Prime Minister Attlee announced on February 20, 1947, that the government definitely intended to transfer power into responsible Indian hands not later than June, 1948, the decision was quickly approved, in spite of opposition leader Winston Churchill's slashing attack with his familiar eloquency. On July 10, the bill was given an unopposed second reading and the story was all but over. On February 28, 1948, the last British troops in India sailed for home, and, with a final flourish of pageantry, closed the curtain on almost two hundred years of military occupation. In August, 1947, India had become a Dominion, with Lord Mountbatten as Governor-General of the Dominion and Mohammed Ali Jinnah as Governor-General of Pakistan. Behind them, the British regiments left many evidences of the long British occupation; to bitter nationalists they left a heritage of hatred; to the Indian army, a tradition of service discipline; to historians, the material debris of an era which, whatever else it was, was always colorful. The departure was also followed by bloody conflicts among the various Indian groups—a story, however, which will not be treated here.

Burma. The House of Commons also dealt kindly with the Burma Bill, giving Burman independence outside the British Commonwealth; the treaty between Britain and Burma was signed on October 17, 1947, and the bill introduced in the House of Commons in November. Winston Churchill fought sturdily against the bill, speaking with bitter sarcasm of the Burmese leaders' earlier cooperation with the Japanese and of the "fearful retrogression" which Britain's abandonment of responsibility in the east was bringing upon the world. He ran into opposition in his own Conservative Party, however, and had weak support when the voting was done.

Eire. In February, 1948, Eamon de Valera, the New York-born son of a Spanish father, had to resign as the Prime Minister of Ireland, a position he had held for sixteen years.

Ireland, like the rest of the world, had economic difficulties. Her hard-working three million people had seen living costs about double since 1939; inflation was a threat; taxes were heavy; labor was discontented. de Valera's sixteen years had stirred a desire for something new, perhaps for a party or a personality looking more directly into the future and not so much preoccupied with a bygone passion and romance. The elections of February 3, 1948, were lost to de Valera, whose Fianna Fail had lost its former ma-

jority in the 147-seat Dail; only 66 seats were taken by Fianna Fail. The real triumph was scored by an independent, Dublin's diminutive alderman and onetime Lord Mayor, Alfred Byrne, who refused to do any campaigning at all. On the strength of a newspaper ad proclaiming "Alfie needs a helping hand!" Byrne romped into Parliament with 13,066 votes—the third highest figure in the land. But John A. Costello, former Attorney General, was elected Prime Minister of Ireland. But just how long his government, made up of many diverse components, would last was the subject of much speculation. It was a coalition of five opposition parties whose strongest bond was the desire to upset the de Valera regime; otherwise they had not much in common, and their unity might well turn out to be a fragile creation. Costello belonged to the rather conservative Fine Gael party, long the chief parliamentary opposition to de Valera; he took into his Cabinet representatives of parties considerably to the left of his own. The coalition government called for attacking the high cost of living, for attacking the housing shortage by stimulating the building of homes for the working and middle classes, instead of luxury construction, the taxing of unreasonably high profits and the building up of the inadequate Irish social services (unemployment, health and old age insurance).

Ceylon. For 2,000 years the Lion flag of Kandy waved defiantly over the Indian Ocean island of Ceylon. Under it the Sinhalese Buddhist Kings struggled and connived with invading Princes and rival island chieftains for uncertain sovereignty over their huge (25,000 square miles) island of blue mountains, green jungles and yellow sands. Then Ceylon became a British Crown Colony, and in 1815 the Lion of Kandy was hauled down to make place for another, more famous member of his species.

On February 10, 1948, in a setting of regal splendor and in the presence of representatives of twenty-seven nations, the Duke of Gloucester inaugurated the first Dominion Parliament of Ceylon. This formalized the island's independence after 351 years, from the first foreign settlements through the period of its status as a British Crown Colony, Ceylon became an independent partner in the British Commonwealth on February 4, 1948, and the British Lion was only a guest in Ceylon. By a peaceful act of Britain's Parliament, Ceylon—like Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Eire, India and Pakistan—had become a sovereign Dominion of the British Commonwealth.

Dominions and the United Nations. One of the best mirrors for seeing the British Commonwealth of Nations as it stood in 1948, new in concept, individual in national sovereignty, united in the gravest world political issues, is the United Nations. Here, in the councils of 57 government associations for peace, seven of the eight Dominions of the British Commonwealth played their self-determined political roles with greater freedom and greater individuality than ever before.

It was the first time (in 1948) that a British Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations appeared at the United Nations to conduct the United Kingdom's side of a case, when Philip Noel-Baker, who was holding this position, arrived at Lake Success from London to deliver the views of Great Britain on the dispute between the Dominions of India and Pakistan, over the prized territory of Kashmir. The Office of Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations was new, being an outgrowth of the former British governmental offices for India and Dominion Affairs; it symbolized now the new concept of the Commonwealth which is now officially defined by His Majesty's government as referring to all Britannia, from the non-selfgoverning territories, such as the Gold Coast, to the fully sovereign nations, such as Canada.

The very fact that such intra-British disputes as that over Kashmir and the South African-Indian racial case were brought before the United Nations, instead of being allowed to remain solely within the diplomatic purview of the British Commonwealth, and the fact that the United Kingdom continued to restrict itself to such an objective role in the United Nations on these issues emphasized the continually increasing intellectual independence of each member nation of the Commonwealth. On the other hand, on such fundamental issues as the international control of atomic energy and the terms of the German and Japanese peace treaties all the Dominions of the Commonwealth were substantially in full agreement. The development of the old British Empire into the new British Commonwealth of Nations was a dynamic political phenomenon that reaffirmed the historian's faith in the slow but well-working processes of Anglo-Saxon democracy.

SECTION III

TRANSITIONAL AREAS OF EMPIRE

Toward Dominion Status. While all of the Empire is in process of alteration and change under the interrelated impact of world opinion, new British points of view, and increasing colonial demands for political rights, certain areas are most clearly destined for fundamental readjustments in their position. Newfoundland had in fact achieved full Commonwealth status, but due to financial difficulties was by common consent reduced to a semi-colonial position in 1934. Responsible government was suspended, and in its place was provided a Governor-in-Commission. The Governor is appointed by the Crown and is responsible to the Dominions Secretary. He is assisted by a Commission of six, three drawn from Newfoundland and three from the United Kingdom. Britain has underwritten Newfoundland finances, and this arrangement is to continue until the country again becomes self-supporting.

Southern Rhodesia by a narrow margin voted against joining the Union of South Africa in 1922, and the British bought out the company that was governing the area in 1924. It has since been termed a self-governing Colony, subject to the Dominions Office in external affairs and in some of its relations with the natives. There is some agitation for the union of Southern and Northern Rhodesia, and also for a junction with the Union of South Africa. Some type of Dominion relationship is ultimately anticipated.

Burma has been the center of a vigorous policy of reconstruction after the ravages of enemy occupation during World War II. The elements supporting the Japanese were discredited as a result of the experiences of occupation by this temporarily victorious nation, and a more liberal nationalism has come to the fore. A Governor and an Executive Council of ten members were charged with administration while a new Constitution was being formulated. Ultimate self-government was assured the

²¹ A recent writer seriously assays the prospects of the growth of totalitarianism among both Moslem and Hindu groups. See Patrick Lacey, *Fascist India* (London: Nicholas and Watson, 1946).

Burmese at the close of the war,²² and this was reaffirmed in 1946. Ceylon accepted a new Constitution in 1945 which carried it well along the road to responsible government,²³ and Malta is moving firmly in the same path.

Palestine, Storm Center of the Near East. Nowhere have the ramifications of Empire policy been more confused than in the British Mandate of Palestine. As a Christian nation, the United States is more than casually interested in the affairs of the Holy Land, but there is also a legal concern inasmuch as America was a party to the treaty arrangement under which Britain obtained her Mandatory position. This small country is a vivid illustration of the clash between humanitarianism and power politics in the modern world.

Throughout the long centuries since the Romans drove them into exile, many Jews had dreamed of returning to the land of their ancestors. A Viennese journalist, Theodor Herzl, mobilized this sentiment into a political movement in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Zionism, as the organization was called, drew support from many countries, and its goal was the reconstitution of Palestine as a refuge and a haven for world Jewry. Although a few thousand Jews already had been settled in Palestine before World War I, the movement was slow. To mobilize Jewish sentiment on behalf of the Allies, Lord Balfour made his famous declaration in 1917: "His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

The Congress of the United States adopted a resolution in 1922 concurring with this view. Britain was given a Mandate under the League of Nations, Article 2 providing: "The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home as laid down in

²² *Burma. Statement of Policy by His Majesty's Government*, Cmd. 6635 (1945).

²³ *Ceylon. Report of the Commission on Constitutional Reform*, Cmd. 6677 (1945).

the preamble, and in the development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine irrespective of race and religion . . ." Other articles included a commitment to "facilitate Jewish immigration, providing the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced," and finally, "the consent of the Council of the League of Nations is required for any modification of the terms of this Mandate." Since the United States did not ratify the Covenant of the League, a separate treaty was concluded with Great Britain and ratified in 1925, with the United States consenting to the administration of Palestine by Britain under terms of the Mandate.

This seemed clear enough, and might have remained so, had it not been for the important fact that Britain had also made wartime commitments to the leaders of the Arabs in order to enlist their support against the Turks. The colorful T. E. Lawrence and the official British representative to the Arabs, McMahon, had each made pledges of ultimate independence. In the desperate necessities of the war, the possibly conflicting nature of these promises to Jews and Arabs was not likely to be a source of much concern.

However, as the Zionists turned enthusiastically to the hopeful task before them, a mounting opposition appeared in Arabia. The contention was made that Palestine was an integral part of the area in which the Arabs had been promised independence. Even apart from this, it was argued, Britain had no right to create a new State in the midst of the Near East and to bring to it a host of immigrants. The British attempted to mollify both elements, but succeeded only in adding to the confusion. Reinterpretation of the meaning of the phrase "national home" in the Balfour declaration cast doubt upon the earlier idea that it was a promise of an independent Jewish State. On the other hand, the British denied that they had committed themselves to full independence for Arabs throughout the entire area.

Clashes between Jews and Arabs, and with the British administrators, were sidelights of the dispute, but throughout the twenties and most of the thirties the Jews worked wonders in the transformation of the land, which they had to purchase at high prices, to a fertile and prosperous agricultural domain,

dotted with growing and efficiently administered communities. Through these years, British official investigations, reports, and White Papers followed one another in an often inconsistent and contradictory sequence. The increasing importance of oil in modern living and in military operations tied Britain to the Arabians who controlled some of the world's greatest resources of this precious fluid. Moreover, while the unity of the Moslem world has often been overstressed, there is nevertheless a real bond among these peoples, and the British were desirous of avoiding new sources of friction which might have repercussions in India.

The rise of Fascism in Germany began a new chapter in Palestinian history. On the one hand, Hitler's sadistic attacks upon the Jews drove many of them to Palestine, thus greatly swelling the immigration and the wealth of the country. On the other hand, German and Italian agents began fomenting hatred of both Britain and the Jews throughout the Arabian world. This led to a major outbreak of rioting in the years 1933-36.

As the clouds of war gathered, the British were hard pressed to achieve a workable Palestinian policy. Their attempt in this direction was expressed in the White Paper of March 17, 1939.²⁴ This document declared: (1) It was not British policy to make Palestine a Jewish state; (2) Palestine could look forward to independence in ten years, with certain commercial and military relations under treaty terms with the British, and with Arabs and Jews sharing in the government; (3) When sufficient order had been restored, Palestinians would gradually be placed in charge of all departments of government, assisted by British advisors and under the final control of the High Commissioner; (4) Palestinian department heads would be appointed from both sections of the country on a proportional basis; (5) Ultimate independence would require "the protection of the different communities in Palestine in accordance with the obligations of His Majesty's Government to both Arabs and Jews" and for the special position in Palestine of the Jewish national home; (6) Immigration would be limited to a total of 75,000 in the ensuing five years, to bring the Jewish population to approximately one-third of the total population of the country, after which no more

²⁴ *Palestine, Statement of Policy*, Cmd. 6019 (1939).

Jewish immigration would be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine approved; and (7) the High Commissioner was given power to prohibit and regulate land transfers to "safeguard" the Arabs. Immediately following this statement, the Jews were prohibited from buying land in the 82% of Palestine occupied by the Arabs. It was also apparent that this meant an end to Jewish immigration into Palestine after the five-year tapering off period, for Arabs would certainly not consent to a further influx.

The White Paper was denounced by the Labor Party at its Conference in 1939 as "a further surrender to aggression," and as "imposing new and intolerable restrictions on Jewish immigration." It was formally rejected by the Permanent Mandates Commission and was never submitted for approval to the Council of the League of Nations. The Zionists and Palestinian Jews refused to regard the policy as legal under the terms of the Mandate. As Fascist oppression increased and Germany began to sweep through Europe, the stream of refugees became a torrent, and many of these made their way into Palestine in violation of the British rules. Through and after the war, Jewish bitterness grew, with the conviction that some, at least, of the 6,000,000 Jews killed by Hitler might have been saved if free immigration to Palestine had been permitted.

In view of Labor's position in 1939, there was hope of a revision of policy in Palestine when the Attlee Government was formed in 1945. However, the White Paper policy was continued, and early in 1945 another investigation was conducted, this time by a Joint Anglo-American Committee of twelve, six from each nation. The unanimous report of this Committee was reached in April, and it embodied these recommendations and comments: (1) "The 'Displaced Persons' problem is a responsibility for the whole world, and must be solved by implementing the provisions of the United Nations Charter calling for 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion'"; (2) Immediately 100,000 Jews should be admitted to Palestine; (3) Palestine should be neither a Jewish nor an Arab state, but interests of all groups should be protected by international guarantees; (4) The Mandate should be continued pending a Trusteeship Agreement under the United Nations; (5) The Mandatory or Trustee should act to bring the Arab standard of living and education up to the level enjoyed by the Jews; (6) Future immi-

gration policy should follow the Mandate provisions that Jewish immigration shall be facilitated under suitable conditions; (7) Land policy should be changed to permit transactions without restrictions against Jews; (8) Some of the numerous recommended plans for large-scale agricultural and industrial development should be adopted to increase the capacity of the country to support additional population and to raise the living standards of both Jews and Arabs; (9) The educational system should be reformed and made compulsory; and (10) If the Report is adopted, terrorism by either side should be "resolutely suppressed."²⁵

The Report did not bring a new policy, despite Foreign Secretary Bevin's earlier pledge that a unanimous recommendation would be accepted by Britain. When President Truman made a statement favoring application of the policy advanced by the Committee, Bevin rejected this also, and made his explosive remark accusing American politicians of seeking to obtain admission of Jews to Palestine because "they did not want too many of them in New York."²⁶

Further conferences were held in London, and the Zionists themselves appeared finally to be willing to give consideration to some partition of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab areas, although the boundaries would be difficult to determine. From some quarters came strong opposition, however, and the charge that this would mean the "ghettoization" of Palestine. Meanwhile British withdrawal from Egypt had been completed, and this left Haifa as a center of strategic concern to the Empire, both as a base near the Suez, and as an oil outlet. Russian pressure on Turkey and Iran was disquieting, and the British had very practical reasons for desiring to retain and develop bases in the Near East. Reconciliation of Arabian, Jewish, and British needs became more difficult as violence flared. Whatever the ultimate solution demanded by equity and international fair dealing, it

²⁵ *Report of the Anglo-American Committee of Enquiry Regarding the Problems of European Jewry and Palestine*, Cmd. 6808 (1946).

²⁶ This created a storm of protest in America, and Senators Wagner and Mead cabled Bevin calling his remark "anti-Semitic" and "a gratuitous insult," and suggesting that "The American people overwhelmingly believe that lame excuses and new conditions, inconsistent with the pledges of the mandate as well as the recent committee report, are especially unbecoming to those spokesmen like yourself who justly emphasize the integrity of international undertakings and the sanctity of human rights at the bar of international law and opinion." *New York Times*, June 16, 1946, p. 4.

appeared little likely to be reached by the immediate parties, with Jewish extremists and British troops in opposition more than a little reminiscent of the situation in Ireland in 1919. Arabs were also threatening violence against the Jews, although there was considerable question as to the actual military strength which could be mustered by the natives, however numerous they might be. Jewish battalions from Palestine had fought with distinction on the side of the British during the North African campaign, and they provided a nucleus of trained fighting men for any conflict with the Arabs.

Pending anything looking like definitive settlement, Palestine continued to be governed by a High Commissioner, aided by six District Commissioners. The 560,000 Jews and over 1,000,000 Moslems in the total population of 1,800,000 have considerable autonomy within their own communities in matters of religion and local government, under terms of the Religious Communities Ordinance of 1926. The Jewish community has as civil bodies an Elected Assembly, with membership chosen by the list system of proportional representation, and a General Council. The Council deals with the British Government, and administers affairs of the Jewish community according to resolutions of the Assembly. A Hebrew educational system and certain health services are maintained by the community. Religious matters are under the jurisdiction of the Rabbinical Council, just as Moslems look to a Moslem Supreme Council in such matters.

THE CONTINUING COLONIAL EMPIRE

Colonial Policy of the Past. Britain's Empire of the Seven Seas is changing and many of its parts are achieving new stature in the Commonwealth, or may even go their own way in the world. But there remain a number of areas where British authority and responsibility will continue for a considerable period. The Colonies and Protectorates under the direction of the Colonial Office contain over 60,000,000 people and range from Malaya and North Borneo in the Far East, through the African Colonies and Territories, to the islands of the West Indies and the Pacific. The largest area of colonial concern is Africa, with a native population in the British possessions of over 40,000,000, and with these are only 65,000 whites.

For the most part, each Colony has a Governor, aided by a Legislative Council which determines local policy and levies taxes, and an Executive Council charged with administration. The proportion of British members in these bodies has been slowly declining in favor of local leadership, although in the backward areas the British are still strongly in control. A number of the Colonies have partly elected legislatures, while in only a few small Dependencies, mostly of a strategic nature, are there no legislative assemblies at all.

Although the early part of the nineteenth century was a period of considerable colonial expansion, the British policy of the future was anticipated by the abolition of the slave trade in the Empire in 1807, after a long battle in Parliament led by William Wilberforce. Slavery itself continued, however, until the Abolition of Slavery Bill was enacted in 1833 over the bitter opposition of the colonial plantation owners. These people were compensated for their dispossession of property by payment of £20,000,000. International trade in slaves was longer in disappearing, however, and British leadership persisted in the work of persuading the other great powers to give up commerce in human beings.

The scramble for African territory in the latter half of the century does not, in retrospect, present a uniformly pretty picture. But once the pattern had been clarified, Britain found herself in possession of a sprawling area, peopled by an assortment of tribes whose contact with the Western world had for the most part been a sorry experience. The challenge implicit in this situation was accepted by some of the local administrators, and particularly through the exemplary leadership of F. D. Lugard, first British Governor of Nigeria. Already renowned for his military skill and bravery in Nyasaland and Uganda, he turned to the task of bringing rudiments of order and civilization to the people under his jurisdiction. Adapting himself to the limitations of a position in which he had but a few assistants and a small military force to aid him, a policy was begun which became famous as Indirect Rule. Interfering as little as possible with native institutions and authority, he began step by step to direct and persuade the people to give up certain practices inimical to civilized living, such as slavery and murder. Important in this program of indirect government was the District Officer, who traveled from village to village, often under severe hard-

ships and in peril of his life, to explain and administer the laws and to give advice concerning the programs of reform established in the Colony. Development and growth of native institutions was the objective, rather than forcible efforts to abolish them prematurely in favor of ways of living for which the people were not prepared. Subsequently this became part of a broader concept of the Dual Mandate. Briefly, this involved acceptance of a moral obligation to administer colonial affairs in such a way as to benefit the native populations, and at the same time to advance the welfare of the world at large.²⁷

Recent Colonial Policy. Increasingly the terms "trusteeship" and "partnership" are used to indicate the British approach to the dependencies. While these concepts may at times have cloaked abuses, there is no question but that substantial advances have been made in many fields of colonial welfare, from education and health to housing and improved agricultural methods. These possessions have not paid taxes to Britain, nor has a monopoly of economic development and trade been created. At the same time, progress has been retarded by native inertia, by the tenacity of ancient customs, and by the irresponsible exploitation practiced by certain commercial interests.

The beginning of World War II jarred the Conservatives from their complacency about colonial affairs, for rumblings of discontent were sounding in many parts of the Empire. A series of new investigations were conducted in anticipation of a more vigorous policy of colonial development, in keeping with the promises of the Atlantic Charter. Some of these studies revealed serious shortcomings in the growth of colonial services. The Commission on Higher Education, for example, pointed out that in all of the Colonies there were only four institutions of higher learning: The Royal University of Malta, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the University of Hong Kong, and the University of Ceylon.²⁸

In 1940 the Colonial Development and Welfare Act was passed by Parliament, allocating almost \$200,000,000 in a ten-year plan of improvement in the fields of Agriculture, Educa-

²⁷ The leading discussion of the growth of colonial policy is in Lord Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa* (Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1922).

²⁸ *Report of the Commission on Higher Education in the Colonies*, Cmd. 6677 (1945).

tion, Health, and Housing. With this as a precedent, the Labour Government displayed an even greater interest in contributing to a better way of life for the dependent peoples, and in 1945 passed a supplementary act adding five years to the plan and increasing the money available to \$480,000,000. These funds are administered through the Colonial Office on the basis of approved projects submitted by the several Colonies. Supplementary funds for this program are to be raised within the dependent areas.

Working with the Colonial Secretary in this welfare scheme is a Colonial Development and Welfare Advisory Committee, a Colonial Research Advisory Committee, and a Colonial Products Research Council. While there has been opposition from certain quarters, notably from white colonials who fear any modification of their superiority, the program has gone forward rapidly, and a large number of projects have been approved. This will be of immediate benefit to Britain, of course, as well as of long-run advantage, for many of the projects will require personnel and equipment from outside, and the tendency will be to obtain these from the homeland. This is spurred in a practical way by the existence of an important agency which offers assistance to the Colonies in many matters, including finance and purchasing. This is the office of the Crown Agents for the Colonies, three officers appointed by the Colonial Secretary. The staff of this office serve in effect as representatives in England of the Colonies in business matters, and the Colonies pay a reasonable fee for the services thus rendered. Since this office is superior to anything the Colonies can devise individually, they turn to it regularly for purchasing. The Crown Agents do not always select British products, but are instructed to give these preference wherever feasible. Purchases are tested and inspected before they are shipped, to make sure they comply with specifications. The Crown Agents also supply technical and engineering advice, and have been instrumental in developing a system of standards for such important Colonial needs as railways and bridges. Among their other duties, they also design and print the postage stamps of the Colonial Governments.

Another important office under the Colonial Secretary is the Colonial Audit, which provides a central supervision of auditing in all the Colonies. This is an effective guarantee of honesty and a high degree of efficiency in fiscal methods. Also important in

the system is the Colonial Civil Service, which provides a backlog of trained and qualified administrators to work with the locally recruited personnel of the several Colonies.²⁹

The rate of progression in self-government to be achieved through the new British effort yet to unfold. Moreover, there is a continuing doubt as to whether or not self-governing Colonies will want to remain in attachment to the Empire family. However, colonial peoples appear destined to gain freedom one way or another, and it would appear that the policy of lending them a helping hand is one least likely to produce ingratitude. It is in this light that the receding tide of traditional British Imperialism should be viewed. The object of the Colonial development and welfare policy is to uncover a firm footing for freedom, rather than to see the formation of new quicksands of totalitarianism.

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE WORLD

The Foreign Office. The mechanics of British foreign relations are relatively simple. The Crown appoints all foreign representatives, and negotiates all international agreements. Treaties do not require direct Parliamentary approval, although this may in effect become necessary if some positive action such as a grant of money is required. The Crown may declare war and make peace. This means, of course, that the British Cabinet has full control of the formulation and execution of foreign policy, subject to continuing Parliamentary support. Thus Mr. Chamberlain carried through the policy of appeasement with the backing of Parliament, and the Government survived the immediate breakdown of the structure of peace. But after a succession of disastrous setbacks, the withdrawal of the British from Norway proved a last straw and Chamberlain's Cabinet could no longer command Parliamentary confidence. Inquiries may be directed to the Foreign Secretary during the Question Hour, and this gives members an opportunity to participate in some aspects of foreign policy. From time to time the Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary will make a major speech on some general or particular phase of current policy, and this may be followed by vigorous debate. In the

²⁹ A helpful chart of the Colonial Office and its related agencies is in W. E. Simnett, *The British Colonial Empire* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1942), pp. 250-251, and see Ch. IX, "Colonial Central Administration."

House of Lords a motion for papers on a subject such as Palestine, or the Displaced Persons problem, or Colonial nutrition, may touch off a very thorough discussion in which men currently and formerly active in Empire affairs will contribute many cogent arguments and suggestions. Cabinet representatives of the Lords may report such sentiments to the Government in a way that will lead to incorporation in the policy of the day. In special areas, the Secretaries for the Dominions, Colonies, or India will have special significance in Cabinet decisions in the foreign field, and at other times the Defense Ministers will be of particular influence. At no time can the processes of foreign relations be delayed or interrupted by a minority of obstinate legislators, as may occur in the United States Senate where treaty approval requires a two-thirds majority.

The Foreign Office of Great Britain has general charge of the Foreign Service, in which both consular and diplomatic personnel are combined. Commercial activities of consuls are subject to special supervision by the Department of Overseas Trade which is controlled both by the Foreign Office and by the Board of Trade. Recruitment to the Foreign Service follows Britain's high standards for administrative capacity, and the opportunities afforded this career staff in Britain's world Empire make it one of the most efficient—and, on occasion—most formidable diplomatic units of any of the leading Powers.

British Foreign Policy. In modern times, Britain has first sought to maintain a European balance of power, acting as an intermediary to prevent any one Continental power from achieving ascendancy. The system toppled into war in 1914, and preoccupation with the Russian development led to a miscalculation of German intentions that was almost disastrous. Another continuing element of British policy has been the protection of the Empire life-line through the Mediterranean and the Suez. Through this comes the oil and gold, food and men, which Britain depends upon for aid in time of crisis. Freedom of the seas is a corollary of this principle, and a strong navy an inevitable accompaniment.

In the immediate postwar era, Britain, like the other great powers, carried on a policy operating at two levels. Basically the traditional techniques were employed and considerations of economic and military coercion, strategic geographical disposition, and political bargaining were evident parts of the relations with

Greece and Spain as well as with the States of the Commonwealth. Many of Britain's external policies on this plane can only be understood by appreciating how strongly she regards the Empire as a security organization. Twice it has stood as a world bulwark of defense and support when the British Isles were engulfed in global warfare. There is no immediate disposition to yield this view of the usefulness of Empire in underwriting Britain's international position.

The higher level of British policy is connected with the United Nations and other international organizations for world order. Britain was almost defeated in World War I by the instrument of the submarine, and in World War II she suffered an even more harrowing ordeal from the air. Her vulnerability to the inevitable weapons of any future war is grimly evident. Her dependence upon a United Nations security system is therefore great. In working with this organization, Britain has shown a tendency to unite with the Dominions on most questions, and to go along with the United States a large share of the time. However, Foreign Secretary Bevin in his radio address of December 22, 1946, made this significant remark: "The war left two great powers preponderant—the United States of America and Soviet Russia. Great Britain lies midway in geography and way of life. Whereas Soviet Russia and the United States are land empires, their metropolitan territory occupying a vast area, Great Britain and the Commonwealth are spread over the Seven Seas." This may suggest a tendency on the part of England to attempt a balance of power policy within the United Nations.

RECENT TRENDS

During 1947–48, war fear was growing in Britain, as well as among all nations of the world. The world situation was deteriorating faster than anybody would have expected at the end of World War II.

Palestine. The difficult task of administering the League of Nations mandate for Palestine became more and more difficult, even after the decision for partition was taken by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1948—a position, again, reversed by the Security Council in 1948. Throughout, the British showed impatience with the lack of comprehen-

sion of the British position shown by the outside critics. When the vote on partition came, the United Kingdom abstained. India and Pakistan voted against partition and the other Dominions voted for it. Subsequently British troops were involved in the attempt to keep order.

Britain Shifts Empire Ideas. Britain's principal aim in surrendering the Palestine mandate on May 15, 1948, and in withdrawing the last of her troops by August 1, was to rid herself of a crushing responsibility that was returning her neither political nor economic advantage. Not the least of many reasons the British Government was determined on pulling out from Palestine was the critical shortage of manpower in Britain's mines and factories and on the farms. Britain's military strength was being gradually transferred from Palestine via Cyprus to Kenya in Eastern Africa, where she is building a mighty base. Safe for the moment in her African domains—where she anticipates no immediate flowerings of the class struggle nor the dictatorship of a native proletariat—Britain was hoping to catch her breath. Too impoverished, too exhausted and too disillusioned to struggle on in Palestine against overwhelming odds, Britain had made a strategic retreat. It was not her first; both her people and her admirers were, however, certain that she would come back.

The men who were responsible for Britain's foreign policy in 1948—former trade union chief Ernest Bevin and his diplomatically experienced aides at the Foreign Office—conceded that the old-style "empire" based on force was finished; but they stoutly maintained that the new policy of the Commonwealth and the voluntary association of friendly states will replace it and will in the future prove far stronger and more enduring.

British policy in withdrawing from Palestine must, therefore, be interpreted in the light of this new concept; it was a policy dictated in the first part by Britain's urgent need to "cut her losses" wherever she could no longer hold on and, in the second part, by the realization that her future depended largely on winning the friendship of the millions of native peoples whom once she administered by the right of strength.

Britain in the Line-up Against Russia. At the same time, England was trying to stop the ever-advancing "push" of the Russian might, whether in Greece, or in Austria or on the Elbe, or in the United Nations. While the democratic nations of Europe were trying to find a secure basis for peace through negotiation and

agreement, Soviet Russia was, at the same time, persistently and systematically destroying the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in Central-Eastern Europe. It was this ruthless course of action and this clear design to extend it to the remaining free nations of Europe that was intensifying the critical situation in Europe. The tragic death of the democratic Republic of Czechoslovakia in February, 1948 (described in the respective chapter of this volume) sent a shock through the civilized world and led England, always ready to support the post-World War II policies of the United States, to stiffen its resistance to Russia's schemes. On March 17, 1948, the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Economic Cooperation between Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg was signed. It was aimed at consolidating all western Europe into an economic and military federation in which Britain was to play a leading role.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, JAMES TRUSLOW, *Empire on the Seven Seas* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940). The second volume of a major work on the expansion of British rule, bringing the material up to the outbreak of World War II.
- AMBEDKAR, B. R., *States and Minorities, What Are Their Rights and How to Secure Them in the Constitution of Free India* (Bombay: Thacker, 1947).
- BARKER, ERNEST, *The Ideas and Ideals of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1941). A brief but authoritative introductory discussion by one of Britain's outstanding scholars.
- CARRINGTON, C. E., *An Exposition of Empire* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948). A historical background for current problems of the British Commonwealth and its dependencies.
- CLOKIE, H. McD., *Canadian Government and Politics* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1944). A standard work by a Canadian authority.
- COATMAN, JOHN, *India, The Road to Self-Government* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1941). Reviews the long march from native disunity to the Government of India Act of 1935.
- CONDLIFFE, J. B., *New Zealand in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930). A study of the economic and social background of this nation's pioneering welfare program.
- COUPLAND, REGINALD, *The Indian Problem* (London: Oxford Uni-

- versity Press, 1944). Three volumes in one by a member of the Cripps Mission; Volume II reviews Indian Politics, 1936-1942.
- CUMMING, SIR JOHN GHEST, *Political India, 1832-1932* (London: Oxford University Press, 1932). A good account of the growth of British rule.
- DAWSON, ROBERT MACGREGOR, *The Development of Dominion Status, 1900-1936* (London: Oxford University Press, 1937). Contains considerable helpful source material.
- DE KIEWIT, C. W., *A History of South Africa* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941). The social and political growth of the Dominion.
- GRATTAN, C. HARTLEY, *Introducing Australia* (New York: John Day, 1942). Readable account by an American journalist-editor.
- JONES, G. L., *Tumult in India* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1948). A correspondent presents the problems of India today and outlook of its people and leaders.
- KEITH, SIR ARTHUR BERRIEDALE, *The Governments of the British Empire* (New York: Macmillan, 1935). A thorough study of political and legal institutions in the Empire by a leading scholar.
- , *A Constitutional History of India, 1600-1935* (London: Methuen and Co., 2nd Ed., 1937). The full account of India's political development.
- , *British Commonwealth of Nations, Its Territories and Constitutions* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1943). A brief sketch by this authority, for wartime information purposes.
- KNAPLUND, PAUL, *The British Empire, 1815-1939* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941). A well-written history, with a useful bibliography, covering the growth from the end of the Napoleonic Wars to World War II.
- LEACOCK, STEPHEN, *The British Empire, Its Structure, Its Unity, Its Strength* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1940). A sympathetic and thoughtful study by a Canadian political scientist.
- MCGUIRE, PAUL, *Experiment in World Order* (New York: W. W. Morrow, 1948). An inquiry into the English world system.
- MOSS, WARNER, *Political Parties in the Irish Free State* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1933). An objective study of the rise of the political structure of Eire.
- WHEARE, K. C., *The Statute of Westminster and Dominion Status* (London: Oxford University Press, 2nd Ed., 1942). The crystallization of Commonwealth relationships is here fully analyzed.
- WHYTE, SIR FREDERICK, *India, A Birds-Eye View* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, Rev. Ed., 1944). A helpful short work covering the essentials of the Indian scene.
- WILLIAMSON, J. A., *Great Britain and the Empire* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1945). An excellent account by a competent historian.

FRANCE

PRINCIPAL GOVERNMENTAL FEATURES OF
THE FOURTH REPUBLIC

The Constitution of the Fourth Republic adopted in 1946 by popular vote follows the continental tradition, though with certain departures due to its formulation by Leftist parties. True, ultimate control, as in Great Britain, resides in the National Assembly, the popularly-elected branch of the national legislature. But unlike the British system, Parliament elects the President of the Republic for a seven-year term and confirms the appointment of the Premier by the President of the Republic by an absolute majority vote at the beginning of each legislature. This provision highlights the apparent determination of the framers to keep the Cabinet under constant surveillance and control by the Parliament. The National Assembly also elects the members of the High Court of Justice and in large part the members of the Assembly of the French Union (the policy-making body of the French Empire), and the Economic Council (an advisory body to the National Assembly on economic questions).

The upper house, called the National Council of the Republic, a body which is elected indirectly by a complicated electoral college system, has a suspensory veto only upon legislation and no control over the Cabinet. Lacking the prestige and even the limited powers of the British House of Lords, the National Council seems to resemble more closely the Reichsrat of the German Weimar Republic, though it is based upon local rather than state areas. Certainly this weak successor to the powerful Senate of the Third Republic falls far short of equalling the great powers of the Senate of the United States.

Two provisions indicate a desire to secure the Cabinet stability exemplified in the British system. These are (1) that the Cabinet may be forced out of office only by a vote of want of confidence or of censure given on due notice and after an adverse vote in

the National Assembly consisting of an absolute majority of the membership and (2) the power of the Premier, after consultation with the President of the Republic, to force a dissolution of the Assembly. But this can be done only after eighteen months of its term of office has expired. These measures seem half-hearted attempts to obtain longer tenure and greater firmness in the executive than was true under the Third Republic but they give little promise of achieving for France a strong executive comparable to the British Cabinet. The number of parties is somewhat less than before the war but, assuming continuation of the three dominant groups in Parliament, coalition Cabinets will continue to be necessary. Hence, the requirement of an absolute majority vote to insure removal of the Cabinet seems of little avail.

The President of the French Republic, who is elected for a seven-year term by both houses of Parliament, bears little resemblance to the American President. He appoints all chiefs of diplomatic missions abroad, designates the Premier, and may send bills back to the Assembly for a second reading. However, he lacks the veto power and all of his political acts must be countersigned by a minister. Clearly the framers preferred a weak executive to one like the powerful head of the American Union. His position seems less effective even than the President of the Third Republic. Unless General Charles de Gaulle's demands for a strong executive are given more attention and the present constitution amended, little will have been gained by the lessons of the past.

In some respects, the new French Constitution goes beyond the American instrument in its recognition of international realities and the rights of man. In addition to recognizing the fundamental rights of man affirmed by the Constitution of 1789, it renounces aggressive war and, on condition of reciprocity, consents to limitations on the sovereignty of the French nation in order to secure adequate international organization for peace. The right to join a trade union, resort to collective bargaining, and participate in the management of business is also conceded. The right of asylum for political refugees is guaranteed.

These rights are interpreted and applied, however, by the judicial branch of the government which, by the Constitution, is brought under the direct control of the National Assembly. This violates the American conception of an independent

judiciary and leads to suspicion that the courts might, under pressure from the legislature, fail to enforce these basic rights of citizens. The fact also that the Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the lower house or a three-fifths vote of both houses makes it comparatively easy to amend away guarantees of rights. This, too, seems dangerous to Americans who are prone to believe that popular rights stated in the Constitution should be protected against attacks from the political arms of the government by providing a judiciary free from political control and making the Constitution difficult to change.

GEOPOLITICS

France before 1940 presented the example of a nation with great riches, standing constantly in fear of losing them. Possessed of a homeland slightly larger in size than post-1918 Germany,¹ the French people were potentially in much happier circumstances due to a smaller population, abundance of fertile agricultural land and adequate mineral resources available either in metropolitan territory or open to them in the world markets. Much of France's deficiencies in needed commodities were supplied by imports from her colonies, comprising a total area of 5,000,000 square miles and a population of 65,000,000. The comparative population density of France (197 per square mile), coupled with adequate natural resources, secured for her people much more elbow room than was found in any other great European State, as well as an opportunity for much larger per capita income.

French prewar fears for the security of their country were due to two dangerous, yet incontestable facts: (1) France's declining population; and (2) the existence on her eastern frontier of a great and warlike power with a population two-thirds larger than her own. In spite of family allowances and other inducements, French population statistics indicated a decline of 3,000,000 in the total population by 1950 (37,282,000) whereas Nazi activities in Germany had brought her population into balance through a substantial increase in the birth rate. Comparatively speaking, France was becoming a nation with declining numbers

¹ 212,659 square miles compared to 180,000 for Germany.

of men of military age whereas Germany was increasing her already great military advantage in young manpower.²

Since she could not cope with her dangerous neighbor alone, France sought security in Allies. Rebuffed by the United States after World War I and fearing to depend upon Russia, then in the throes of a Communist revolution, and unable to win Great Britain to what the French considered the realities of the situation,³ statesmen of the Third Republic were forced to build a security system consisting of alliances with Poland and the Little Entente nations (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania) which collapsed under pressure.⁴

World War II Effects. The defeat of Germany in the spring of 1945 released France from German enslavement but left her crippled in manpower, raw materials and productive capacity. Her population decline, accelerated by the loss of 3,000,000 men killed and wounded in World War I, had reached the proportions of a national calamity through the deliberate Nazi policy of keeping over 2,500,000 French war prisoners and workers in Germany for four years. The census of March 10, 1946, showed a total population, including 1,670,729 foreigners, of 40,517,923, a decline of 1,389,000 since the census of 1936. The recovery of France will be slow and, without a startling reversal of form, it is doubtful if she can ever achieve her former greatness.

THE THIRD REPUBLIC AND ITS DOWNFALL

Historical Background. The existence in France since the French Revolution of two hostile and irreconcilable coalitions, the conservative authoritarian Right, upholder of the traditions of prerevolutionary, monarchical France, and the liberal, republican Left, sponsors and supporters of republican institutions and democratic ideals of the Revolution of 1789, always posed a contingent threat to the safety of the Third Republic. Rightist

² In 1940, France had only 6,000,000 young men in the prime military ages between 15 and 34 compared to 11,300,000 for Germany. See F. S. Notestein, et al., *The Future Population of Europe and the Soviet Union* (Geneva: League of Nations, 1944), pp. 131-137. Also D. V. Glass, *The Struggle for Population* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), Chs. II, III, V.

³ Until the opening stages of World War II, Great Britain was afraid of French hegemony in Europe and sought to use Germany as a counterweight.

⁴ W. N. Hadsell, "Struggle for New France," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XX (July 15, 1944), pp. 1-2.

parties, particularly those of monarchical tendencies, and the Fascists were enemies of the Republic and a continuing danger to its very existence. The reluctance of the French to compromise their political views and the individualism and rationalism of the French character reenforced this tendency to disunity.⁵ Parties of the Center, principally the Federation of the Left and the Radical-Socialists, should have furnished the balance to hold the contending coalitions together. Unfortunately, though these parties represented the middle classes, the backbone of the Republic, they mirrored too well the provincial, money-grabbing, conservative, and privilege-seeking petit bourgeoisie who, fearful of delegating power and jealous of their rights, set up straw men to be their leaders. These, unfortunately, became the leaders of France in her hour of peril.⁶

The national psychological disunity reflected by these circumstances has made for political instability throughout the modern history of France. Since the Revolution, France has had, up to 1940, two monarchies, two empires, and three republics. Events since 1940 have added to this list a pre-fascist dictatorship, a provisional government, and the Fourth Republic.

Prior to 1940, socialism made little headway against the capitalist-democratic principles of the French middle classes who, with their ideals rooted in the Revolution of 1789, formed the solidifying element of the Republic. Growth of large-scale industry in urban centers after World War I facilitated the spread of radicalism in those areas but peasants and small shopkeepers continued to form the bulk of the population. Nevertheless, the growth of the radical parties and their coalition in the Popular Front of 1936 welded authoritarian and capitalistic groups into a solid opposition verging on fascism.

The Third Republic. Having its origin largely in historical accidents, fragmentary in composition, and omitting a bill of rights, the Constitution of the Third Republic of 1875 showed a tendency to imitate British constitutional forms. A president with nominal powers, elected for seven years by Parliament, designated the Premier who, in turn chose a ministry. The Min-

⁵ André Siegfried, *France, A Study in Nationality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), pp. 12-17.

⁶ Cf. André Geraud, *The Gravediggers of France* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1944), pp. 93-99, and J. C. Fernand-Laurent, *Gallic Charter* (New York: Little, Brown, and Co., 1944), pp. 86-87.

istry held office at the pleasure of the Chamber of Deputies, though sometimes it resigned on adverse votes by the Senate. The Chamber of Deputies was elected by popular vote for four years, and the Senate by electoral colleges, made up mostly of representatives of the Communes, for nine years. Local government was highly centralized under the Minister of the Interior who appointed the prefects and subprefects of the Departments and Arrondissements, as French administrative areas are called. The people elected councils of the Communes and Departments.

Causes Leading to the Downfall of the Third Republic. Not all of the causes of the collapse of the Republic are known nor is it possible to list them exactly in the order of their importance. Among the most important, however, are the following:

1. The war weariness of the French people due to the fearful cost to them of World War I, which weakened their will to resist.

2. The defensive psychology of the people and their war leaders, exemplified in their trust in the Maginot line and the policies of Marshal Henri Philippe Pétain and General Gamelin in organizing the French army between 1918-1940.⁷

3. Fear by the French conservatives of the growth of communism in France, especially after formation of the Popular Front in 1936, and their reluctance to join hands with Communist Russia against Germany.⁸

4. The fact that the conservative élite of France, leaders in government and society, had never wholly accepted the Republic and were willing to see it overthrown, to be replaced, they hoped, by a political order more efficient and less self-indulgent in which the authority, discipline, and order of the old regime would be restored.

5. Collaboration of certain big business leaders with Germany through cartels and other business relationships. Their desire to continue this lucrative situation led them to use large sums of money to influence public opinion and the government.⁹

6. The existence of structural weaknesses in the Government facilitated the indecision and infirmity of will of mediocre leaders like Edouard Daladier, Paul Reynaud, and President Albert

⁷ See André Geraud's excellent treatment of this, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-134, 313-351.

⁸ C. A. Micaud, *The French Right and Nazi Germany* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1943), pp. 2, 32-33, 228-231.

⁹ L. R. Franck, "The Forces of Collaboration," *Foreign Affairs*, XXI (October, 1942), pp. 46-49.

Lebrun. These defects included (1) Excessive dependence of the cabinet on the Chamber of Deputies because of inability of the Premier to dissolve the Chamber in case of disagreement and the fact that every cabinet was of necessity a coalition of unstable and shifting party groups. The result was excessive turnover of cabinets and lack of executive continuity with consequent adverse effects upon its control over policy. Attempts to strengthen the cabinet during the emergency by giving it power to make law by decree did not solve the difficulty because of the cabinet's inherently weak character.¹⁰ (2) A bureaucratic administration in which the higher officials manifested incompetency and disloyalty to the Republic in many instances while in the lower ranks of the *fonctionnaires* powerful pressure groups were maintained able to compel the government to yield to their demands. Corruption in the departments of administration became a national scandal on the exposé of the Stavisky scandal in 1934.¹¹

7. The Nazi fifth column seized the opportunity to exploit divisions among the French and their reluctance to fight. War veterans, high officials, and social leaders were cultivated and used to promote pro-German sentiments and spread Nazi propaganda.¹²

8. Backed by funds supplied by industrial magnates and encouraged by the Nazis, Fascist leagues and patriotic societies were organized to combat radicalism. Taking advantage of the furor raised by the Stavisky scandal, groups like the Croix de Feu, Camelots du Roi, Jeunesses Patriotes, and Cagoulauds staged an attack on the Government in 1934. Some of these groups later became active supporters of the counter-revolution.¹³

9. To the defection of the conservative, anti-republican groups was added the splitting of the radical groups by Russia's pact with Germany in 1939. Communists adhering to the party line shifted their stand to one of friendliness with Germany. Socialists also were split by the pacifistic, anti-imperialistic, and anti-

¹⁰ Otto Kirchheimer, "Decree Powers and Constitutional Law in France under the Third Republic," *American Political Science Review*, XXXIV (December, 1940), pp. 1104-1123.

¹¹ Alexander Werth, *France in Ferment* (New York: Harpers, 1936), p. 218 ff.

¹² Cf. Pierre Lazareff, *Deadline* (New York: Random House, 1942), Ch. XIII, Heinz Pol, *Suicide of a Democracy* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940), p. 111 ff; and L. R. Franck, "The Forces of Collaboration," *Foreign Affairs*, XXI (October, 1942), pp. 44-58.

¹³ J. C. Fernand-Laurent, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-98.

British stands of many in their ranks. The result was an almost total absence of the will to fight even among staunch adherents of the Republic while, on the other hand, the forces of collaboration, strengthened by England's appeasement policy, moved steadily towards their goal—the overthrow of the Republic and domination of Europe by Germany.¹⁴

THE VICHY RÉGIME

The Armistice and the Counter-revolution. With the French army badly defeated in the field, the Maginot line turned, Paris threatened, and General Maxime Weygand, French Commander-in-Chief, insisting upon an armistice, Premier Paul Reynaud finally handed over his commission to Pétain on June 16, 1940 and thus paved the way for the armistice and the counter-revolution. Headed by Pierre Laval and Pétain, a Fascist conspiracy had been organized in Bordeaux where the Government had moved. These plotters against the state were not only anti-republican but anti-British and aimed not only at an armistice but at the overthrow of the Republic and the establishment in its stead of an authoritarian regime. British protests at the defection of her ally were disregarded and her proposal for an Act of Union between Great Britain and France involving a common citizenship, a joint war cabinet and general staff, and unified foreign, financial, and economic policies, as an inducement to keep France in the war, was rejected by the cabinet on the grounds that it would make France a dominion of the British Empire.¹⁵

Pétain announced the intention of his Government to quit the war and called upon the army to cease firing. He then appointed an armistice commission to negotiate with the Germans. The armistice agreement, signed on June 22, provided that France should be divided into three zones: (1) territory to be occupied by the German army for war against the British, which included all

¹⁴ Cf. Franck, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-56, and Victor Vinde, "The Spirit of Resistance," *Foreign Affairs*, XXI (October, 1942), pp. 60-69. For an excellent summary of the causes of the downfall of France, see A. Werth, *The Twilight of France, 1933-1940* (New York: Harpers, 1942), pp. 337-352.

¹⁵ There are many and varied accounts of these events but see especially H. F. Armstrong, "The Downfall of France," *Foreign Affairs*, XIX (October, 1940), pp. 93-112; T. Draper, *The Six Weeks' War* (New York: Viking, 1944) pp. 157-168, 244-313; A. Geraud, *op. cit.*, p. 435 ff. For Pétain's motives, see F. Martel, *Pétain: Verdun to Vichy* (New York: Dutton, 1943), p. 151 ff.

of northern, industrial France; (2) an unoccupied or "free" zone in southern France to be under the control of the French government; and (3) a border zone, including the industrial departments of the Nord and Pas de Calais, to be under German administration. The French war fleet and merchant marine were to be returned to French harbors under German or Italian supervision and "immobilized." War prisoners taken by Germany before the armistice were to be kept in the Reich until the end of the war but the rest of the army could be demobilized. Alsace-Lorraine was to be returned to Germany and France was forced to agree to bear all occupation costs of the German army.¹⁶ A separate armistice was signed with Italy which involved only certain minor territorial adjustments.¹⁷ The liberal armistice terms reflected France's ability to remain in the war with her colonies and navy intact, fears of Hitler that Russia might attack him while engaged in defeating England, or that the United States might enter the war, and his hopes that French cooperation would speed the war to a quick conclusion.¹⁸ French hopes that the armistice would soon be followed by peace proved to be another misreading of Hitler's intentions. Vague replies of the French Government to London's protest against armistice provisions as regards the French fleet, which the British feared would be used by the Nazis to open the way for the invasion of England, were followed by the refusal of the British to allow the French flotilla at Alexandria to return to French ports. The British Navy later demanded that the French fleet at Mers-el-Kebir, Algeria, surrender and be disarmed. When the French commander refused, the British opened fire and destroyed most of the fleet.¹⁹ The French Government moved from Bordeaux to Clermont-Ferrand, and from there, on July 2, to Vichy.

Program of the National Revolution. Sponsors of the new regime aimed at a Government based on a strange mixture of Fascist and Royalist ideas. Rejecting the materialism, individualism, democratic principles, and class conflicts of the Third Republic, they sought to construct a system embodying the three-fold virtues of authority, order, and discipline. Concepts of liberty, equal-

¹⁶ For terms of the Franco-German Armistice in French see H. C. Rice, *France: 1940-1942* (Cambridge: Harvard Cooperative Society, 1942), pp. 10-19.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 19-25.

¹⁸ J. Lorraine, *Behind the Battle of France* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), pp. 3-5.

¹⁹ Cf. A. Geraud, *op. cit.*, pp. 462-463, and J. Lorraine, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-19.

ity, universal suffrage, and parliamentary government fundamental to democratic ideology were rejected. Duties rather than rights were emphasized. A new social hierarchy was projected with equality of opportunity through work as the guiding principle. The family, the neighborhood, and the professions were postulated as the primary social institutions which it was the duty of the state to foster and promote. Yet the state must be superior to all self-seeking groups and able to control them for the common good.

In the economic sphere, all conflicts of labor and capital were to be eliminated through a corporative organization of industry to integrate workers and employers in a cooperative system of production. The program of youth education was expected to foster the virtues of discipline, obedience, and sense of social obligation.²⁰

The New Regime Installed. The National Assembly met at Vichy on July 9–10, 1940, after the two houses had voted separately to amend the constitution. Careful attention was given to the prescribed legal forms in submitting the proposition to change the constitution. After considerable deliberation a measure was submitted to a vote which (1) delegated full powers to the government under the authority and signature of Pétain, (2) authorized Pétain and his cabinet to prepare a new constitution to be promulgated after ratification by the nation; and (3) requested the Senate and Chamber to continue to function until the election of two new chambers to be provided for in the new constitution. Latest research on the legality of Pétain's action in basing his assumption of dictatorial power on this action has demonstrated that the entire procedure was permeated with fraud and the Pétain-Laval dictatorship was in the nature of a coup d'état.²¹

The Form of Government. By the illegal acts of Laval, et al., the republican constitution was suppressed and civil liberties

²⁰ David Popper, "Vichy France Under Hitler," *Foreign Policy Reports* (August 1, 1942), p. 124, and P. Tissier, *The Government of Vichy* (London: Harrap, 1942), pp. 68–87.

²¹ The view taken by Loewenstein and others that the entire procedure was a legal transfer of power was always opposed by Free French writers and the views of the latter have been shown to be correct by Koessler in his recent article. Cf. K. Loewenstein, "The Demise of the French Constitution of 1875," *American Political Science Review*, XXXIV (October, 1940), pp. 872–889, 894–895; J. C. Fernand-Laurent, *op. cit.*, Ch. 12; P. Tissier, *op. cit.*, pp. 18–22; Maximilian Koessler, "Vichy's Sham Constitutionality," *American Political Science Review*, XXXIX (February, 1945), pp. 86–97.

gradually destroyed. André Maurras, royalist philosopher, furnished many of the ideas and Raphael Alibert, Minister of Justice, framed the major statutes and ordinances which ushered in the new regime. By the constitutional acts of July 11 and 12, 1940, Pétain made himself absolute dictator with power not only to interpret the constitution but to set up a new one, and, by his own insistence, decree constitutional acts on his own initiative.²² Later decrees adjourned the Senate and Chamber of Deputies indefinitely; created a Supreme Court; defined the responsibilities of government officials and compelled them to swear an oath of loyalty to Pétain; authorized the Chief of Government (Laval) to make laws and issue them over his own signature; repealed the act making Admiral Darlan successor to Pétain and authorizing the cabinet to name a successor in the event of permanent incapacity of the Chief of State.²³

The Executive. By constitutional decree number one, of July 11, 1940, Pétain made himself Chief of the French State, irremovable and without tenure limitation. Subsequent decrees named Laval, and later, Darlan, as his successor. In default of an available successor, the Council of Ministers was given power to appoint one by a majority vote. Decree number two gave the Chief of State all powers except that the legislature must consent to a declaration of war. His powers included the right to establish a new constitution and to exercise all legislative power in the absence of the assemblies, if enacted within the Council of Ministers. Even after the assemblies were constituted, he could take over the legislative power in emergencies. All fiscal and budgetary matters were under his control, as were, also, all administrative, military, and foreign affairs. He could declare a state of siege, exercise the power of pardon and amnesty, and make administrative arrests without possibility of interference by the courts. He was responsible to no one, except "to history."

The Council of Ministers and the Departments. Under Pétain's plan, the Council of Ministers consisted of the Chief of the State, acting as President of the council, a vice president of the council, and 4 of the 15 Secretaries of State, who were designated as ministers. In 1944, however, 6 Secretaries of State ranked as ministers. All ministers and secretaries were appointed by the

²² A. Geraud, *op. cit.*, pp. 464-466.

²³ For a copy of the constitutional laws and acts of the Vichy Government in French, see H. C. Rice, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-44.

Chief of the State and heads of the respective departments to which they were assigned. Secretaries not included in the council were responsible to a minister and, through him, to the Council of Ministers and the Chief of the State for their political acts. Ministers and the other Secretaries of State were members, also, of a Cabinet Council, presided over by the Vice President of the Council of Ministers, and in addition, secretaries had the right to appear and speak in the Council of Ministers.

The Vice President of the Council directed and coordinated the work of department heads, and had control over the Secretariat for Information, Press, and Radio, and the Office of Jewish Affairs. He reported to the Chief of the State all actions of the Cabinet Council. In the reorganization of April, 1942, the Vice President, Laval, was made head of the government, and President of the Council of Ministers.²⁴ Though the reorganization of administration was intended to secure greater efficiency, constant shifts in personnel and readjustment of bureaus throughout the Vichy period resulted in confusion. However, some improvement of internal organization of departments was achieved.²⁵

The Legislature. Constitutional decree number three indefinitely suspended the two chambers of Parliament and abrogated Article One of the Constitution-Law of 1875 providing for their annual meeting. Salaries were paid their members until June, 1942, when both bodies were dissolved by decree. Popular criticisms of the dictatorial regime led to creation by Pétain's decree, on January 22, 1941, of a Consultative National Council. This body was not based on the constitutional authorization of the National Assembly to provide for legislative assemblies in a new constitution but rested on Pétain's own assumption of power. Its membership was entirely appointive and its function purely consultative. Though its membership reached about 200 members, it was never convened in plenary session. However, this more or less supernumerary body had several active committees and a representative in the government with the rank of minister.

Organization of the Courts. Existing courts of the Third Republic were largely retained by the Vichy Government but a number of new tribunals, mostly of an emergency type, were

²⁴ On this point see P. Tissier, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-79; and L. Marchal, *Vichy: Two Years of Deception* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), p. 193 ff.

²⁵ Cf. D. Popper, *op. cit.*, p. 124; and P. Vaucher, "The National Revolution in France," *Political Science Quarterly*, LVII (March, 1942), pp. 13-14.

created mainly to deal with political offenses. These included a Supreme Court, located at Riom, responsible for trying former high officials of the government charged with responsibility for the war; a Council of Political Justice created by Pétain to advise him on cases of war criminals after failure of the Riom trials; a State Tribunal set up late in 1941 to try cases of sedition; a Special Criminal Court; a Court for Curfew Infractions; and Military Tribunals for summary action on both civil and military cases, established in 1944 to deal with resistance cases.

The Civil Service. The existing Civil Service of the Third Republic was carried over into the new government and with modification continued to function throughout the Vichy period. Following the example of other Fascist regimes, the Pétainists undertook, after June 2, 1941, to purge the Civil Service of all non-French men, all Jews, all members of secret societies, and all persons suspected of having Communist affiliations. As an assurance of their loyalty, all government officials were required to swear an oath of allegiance to the Chief of State. In an attempt to secure efficiency, tenure provisions were abolished and employees made subject to summary dismissal. Unions of government employees were dissolved.

The Commissariats. Eleven commissaries were appointed under a commissary-general responsible directly to the Vice President of the Council. These officials were given roving commissions to make inspections, end abuses, and dismiss incompetent civil servants. Their activities proved so successful that the innovation was adopted by the de Gaulle regime in liberated France.

The Departments. Control of the central government over the departments was increased by making the prefect the sole representative of the Chief of State within the department and directly responsible to him for the exercise of his powers. Advised by a consultative committee of 7-9 members, his powers over budgetary matters and local government were increased. Elective departmental general councils were replaced by appointive councils with similar powers and functions. Arrondissement Councils were adjourned and their powers conferred on the subprefects.

The Communes. In communes of more than 2,000 inhabitants, the mayor, deputy mayor, and councils were appointed by the prefect or by the Minister of the Interior (in the case of large cities). In Paris, the municipal council was replaced by an appointive consultative budget committee. In communes of less

than 2,000, no substantial changes were made except that no elections were held and communal mayors and councillors were subject to suspension by the prefect.

The Regions. Departments were grouped together into 17 administrative regions under regional prefects whose powers included control of police, economic affairs and supervision of local officials. Proposals to restore the ancient provinces failed to mature.

The Armed Forces. Armistice provisions restricted Vichy's armed forces to 100,000 men. This force was maintained until November, 1942, when the Germans took over the "free" zone and dissolved it. A First Regiment of France consisting of several thousand volunteers was then organized under Nazi patronage.

Police and Auxiliary Forces. Police forces were removed from local control and placed under intendants of police appointed by the Minister of the Interior and subject to him. As resistance to the regime increased, all police forces were brought under control of Joseph Darnand who, in January, 1944, was made Under-Secretary in Charge of Maintenance of Order and later Minister of the Interior, taking his orders directly from Laval and Heinrich Himmler, head of the German Gestapo.²⁶

Auxiliary police organized to further the ends of the counter-revolution and later the Gestapo, included "The Legion of War Veterans," founded in 1940 and coming to an end in 1943, and the "Service d'Ordre Legionnaire," better known as the French Militia, which was organized on the pattern of the Nazi Élite Guard and became a tool of Laval and Darnand in their attempts to crush the resistance movement.²⁷

The Navy. Many units of the fleet were sunk by the British at Mers-el-Kebir or scuttled by the French themselves at Toulon when the Germans invaded the "free" zone in November, 1942. Those which escaped and the flotilla detained by the British at Alexandria joined the Allied forces, were reconditioned, and, later returned to the Provisional Government of de Gaulle.

Political Parties and Groups. Through the arrest or disappearance of their leaders, most of the parliamentary parties of the Left fell to pieces, only to be reorganized in a short while as

²⁶ Cf. Paul Vaucher, "The National Revolution in France," *Political Science Quarterly*, LVII (March, 1942), p. 11; David Popper, *op. cit.*, p. 125; and *Free France* (French Press and Information Service), V (February 1, 1944), pp. 126-127.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

members of the underground movement in which the Communist party organizations took the lead. In Vichy, Communists were singled out for persecution. Rightist parties of Fascist persuasion such as the "Parti Social Française" (now called the "Progrès Social Française") and the "Action Française," continued to flourish. No official action was taken to dissolve them, but Pétain urged all parties to forget their differences and rally around him. Attempts of the Vichy chief to form a single party dictatorship as exemplified in the creation, in January, 1941, of a "Committee for the Rally for National Revolution," proved fruitless. As an offset to this Marcel Déat and other pro-Nazis in Paris organized the "Popular National Rally" out of which was formed the "Anti-Communist Legion," given express permission by Pétain to fight against the Russians. Other counter-revolutionary extremist groups included the "French Popular Party" led by Jacques Doriot, the "Groupe Collaboration," "Mouvement du Prisonier," and "Combat d'action Nouvelle." These groups were armed by the Gestapo and organized into "Groupes Mobile Anti-Terroristes" to fight the underground.²⁸

Measures of Repression. As exploitation of France by the Nazis increased and the people became more and more disillusioned, the Pétainist Government increased its measures of repression. Freedoms of speech, press, and association were abolished, labor unions and secret societies dissolved, censorship was strictly imposed upon press and radio and they became the channels through which official propaganda was disseminated. Listening to foreign programs was forbidden. Travel restrictions were placed on foreigners and those unemployed were subjected to the labor draft. Non-citizens were prohibited from entering the civil service, the Bar, medicine, and other professions. Anti-semitic legislation was passed stripping the Jews of legal protection from abuse, and prohibiting their entry into or their continuance in government service, the professions, and many types of business. In order to discourage citizens from joining de Gaulle, all citizens leaving France without permission or who carried on anti-Vichy activities outside of France were deprived of their citizenship. This penalty could be applied to their families.²⁹

²⁸ Cf. P. Tissier, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-116; and *Free France*, V (January 15, 1944), p. 57. For more complete details on the structure of the Vichy Government see P. Tissier, *loc. cit.*

²⁹ P. Tissier, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-170.

Social and Economic Reorganization. Great stress was laid by the Vichy Government upon the reforms instituted for the betterment of the family and youth education. Actually, the heavy occupation costs imposed by the Germans (400,000,000 francs a day) made it impossible to do much to increase family allowances while the progressive confiscation of factories rendered futile the program of employment of family heads. The reform of education resulted largely in a purge of the teaching staffs of the schools and the installation of instruction in Catholic dogmas. The Youth Camps became centers of resistance activities instead of instruction in the ideals of the counter-revolution.³⁰

The French Charter of Labor. In October, 1941, to the accompaniment of loud beating of the drums, a Labor Charter was promulgated, bearing obvious marks of its Italian origin. Purporting to include all productive groups, the Charter prohibited strikes and lockouts and abolished all trade unions and employers' associations. In the 25 categories of production created in February, 1942, to implement the Charter, corporations were formed with mixed syndicates of workers and employers organized on local, regional, and national bases. A Superior Council consisting of the Ministers of Economics and Finance, Labor and Industry, capped the entire structure. Like other reform measures of the ill-fated regime, this innovation also died aborning. Rejected by the labor unions, control of the edifice fell into the hands of the 60 production committees created in the various categories of production. According to Clough, in practice the system facilitated German domination over France's economy and encouraged monopolistic practices by business men on the production committees.³¹

Political Developments, 1940-1944. The successful resistance of the British to the German attack in 1940 doomed the Vichy movement almost from the start. Leaders of the counter-revolution operated on the thesis that defeat of the French Army meant the defeat of Great Britain and the downfall of all democratic institutions in Europe. Being Fascists at heart themselves, they wished this to be so and worked actively for an armistice, hoping and believing that within a short time the war would be over,

³⁰ *Free France*, V (February 1, 1944), p. 127; A. Geraud, *op. cit.*, pp. 479-483; and David Popper, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

³¹ S. B. Clough, "The House That Pétain Built," *Political Science Quarterly*, LIX (March, 1944), pp. 30-59.

and Nazi Germany dominant in Europe. With this thought in mind, they attempted to transform France into a Fascist state, expecting that France might through willing collaboration become a subordinate partner of Germany in the New European order on a level with, if not superior to, Italy. Incidentally, Pétain, Laval, and Darlan, being ambitious men, seized the opportunity before denied them of becoming the dominant figures in the state.³²

Hitler's plans for France varied with circumstances and the fluctuations of Vichy's policies are partly explicable in terms of shifts of Nazi policies since, after the armistice, Hitler had control over French raw materials, foodstuffs, war prisoners, factories, and population movements between the two zones, and used them as weapons to attain his ends. Originally Hitler wanted to use the French coast as a base of operations against England, and the French fleet as a threat against the British Home Fleet and thus force Churchill to capitulate. Meanwhile, the French merchant marine, naval bases, supplies of foodstuffs and raw materials, and colonies as sources of supply, would strengthen Germany's war potential greatly. To accomplish these purposes, Hitler needed Pétain upon whose popular prestige he counted to sway public opinion in the right direction. Laval, always a willing tool, was to be used to engineer the deal.

Montoire Conference. Swollen with pride of office and popular prestige after the armistice yet taken aback by the German defeat at the hands of the British Air Force and the defection of a number of the colonies to de Gaulle, Pétain finally yielded to Laval's persuasion and met Hitler at Montoire on October 26, 1940, where he promised collaboration, hoping to receive in exchange peace and a respectable place in the New Order.³³ Successful British resistance weakened Pétain's influence with the people but made French collaboration more necessary to Germany. Blocked by Italy in his plan to make France a partner in the Axis and egged on by the German General Staff in their design to divide and destroy France as a great power, Hitler began to shut off food and raw materials and impede movement between the two zones, meanwhile absorbing French wealth in money,

³² Jacques Lorraine, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-35, 49-58.

³³ For Pétain's statement accepting collaboration, see H. C. Rice, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67. For interpretation see J. Lorraine, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-43; and A. Geraud, *op. cit.*, p. 477 ff.

factories, and labor power as rapidly as possible. Laval, made Foreign Minister after Montoire, schemed with Hitler for complete and open collaboration even to the point of war against England at the price of a peace treaty, and connived with Otto Abetz, German Ambassador to Paris, to kidnap Pétain and hold him in Paris because the Chief of State's fear of British bombers precluded his consent to the deal. Apprised of Laval's treachery, Pétain, on December 13, dismissed him and his extremist followers from the government, abolishing the post of Vice President of the Council and appointing Pierre-Etienne Flandin as Foreign Minister.

Darlan Succeeds Laval. Increased pressure by Hitler finally compelled Pétain to offer Laval an inferior place in the cabinet which he refused. Whereupon Pétain re-created the office of Vice President of the Council and appointed Darlan to the position, making him, in addition, commander-in-chief of all of Vichy's military forces, and Minister of Foreign Affairs. German demands for Laval's return, which included a threat to set up a rival government in Paris, subsided temporarily when Darlan, after considerable negotiating with Hitler, convinced him of his intentions whole-heartedly to collaborate. This was publicly confirmed when Pétain, on May 15, 1941, publicly announced his approval of Darlan's interview, on May 12, with Hitler at Berchtesgaden.³⁴

Under Darlan, the regime was forced more and more into subjection to the Nazis. Factories were closed, converted to German use, bought up by German cartels, or had their machinery shipped to Germany. A German commissioner was established in Vichy after May, 1941, where he cooperated with the Armistice Commission to direct and supervise affairs to German ends. Military collaboration became an actuality. French ships were used to transport arms to Axis forces in North Africa and Syria. Syrian air fields were opened to German use. The French fleet was employed as a covering force against the Allies in French waters. French Indochina was turned over to the Japanese. Finally, on outbreak of the Russo-German war, in June, 1941, Vichy broke off relations with the U.S.S.R.³⁵

³⁴ For additional details see J. Lorraine, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-89; A. Geraud, *op. cit.*, pp. 504-510; and L. Marchal, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-126.

³⁵ Cf. L. Marchal, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-155; and Leo Gershoy, "France Collaborates," *Current History*, II (March, 1942), pp. 43-46.

Laval Returns to Power. Red Army victories and America's entry into the war caused a definite shift towards resistance on the part of the French public but the quislings in Vichy had gone too far to turn back. Worried by reversals in the fortunes of war, and disgusted with Darlan's failure to make the people swallow collaboration and stem the rising tide of resistance, Hitler insisted upon Laval's return to power. Under Hitler's threat to take over the "free" zone and allow Italy to regain Nice, Corsica, and Savoy, Pétain completely capitulated. On April 20, 1942, Laval was given a new and more impressive post as Head of the Government and assumed, in addition, the positions of President of the Council, and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Interior, and Propaganda. Thus he became actual dictator and Pétain gradually faded out of the picture.

The return of Laval to power provoked a constantly widening breach between French public opinion and Laval's quisling government. Previously hesitant moderates and conservatives now sided with the resistance movement until only confirmed Fascists, big business men who luxuriated in war profits, and quislings in the government remained to support the wavering fortunes of Vichy. On the other hand, Laval bent every effort to assist Germany's war against the Allies. War production was increased, and the compulsory labor draft of workers for German factories was intensified. Unemployment grew and riots began to break out. The Vichy police, French Militia, and auxiliary Fascist groups were utilized to cooperate with the Gestapo to suppress the resistance movement.

Squeezed between a population made hostile by Hitler's inhuman policies, demands of United States representatives that Pétain's promises as regards use of the French fleet and colonies for Axis purposes be kept, and the German dictators constantly increasing pressure for greater war production, Laval managed to retain a precarious hold on power until the end. With the invasion of North Africa by Allied forces in November, 1942, Vichy broke off relations with the United States. Nevertheless, Germany took over the unoccupied zone and attempted to seize the remnants of the French fleet at Toulon but was thwarted in this by the scuttling or escape of most of the fleet units.

Last Days of the Vichy Regime. Though appointment by Hitler of a gauleiter in Vichy removed all pretense from the regime's assumed independence, Pétain still claimed to be holder of the

legitimate sovereignty of France. As the Allies drove Axis troops out of Africa and invaded Italy, the Vichy ringleaders began to give up hope and endeavored to escape the consequences of their treasonable acts by trying to call a meeting of the National Assembly so that Pétain might surrender his powers and thus permit the assembly to select a government favorable to the Allies.³⁶

Failing in this, Pétain then called upon the French people to be neutral in the coming Allied invasion of France while Laval and Darlan, in cooperation with substantial German forces, employed the French Militia and police to attempt to break the power of the Maquis and French Forces of the Interior, military units of the resistance movement. The invasion of France by Allied forces on June 6, 1944, split the Vichy Government into two conflicting groups. One group under Déat, Doriot, and Fernand de Brinon sought to set up a government in Paris directly under German military protection but was forestalled by Laval. The other group endeavored to persuade Edouard Herriot, president of the dissolved Chamber of Deputies, to call a National Assembly to form a union government acceptable to the Germans because it would remain neutral. On Herriot's refusal, Laval and his cabinet fled to Belfort after the cabinet had voted itself out of existence. On August 21, Pétain was arrested by the Germans and taken to Belfort, France. Later he and his quisling associates were removed to Baden, Germany. The defeat of Germany in May, 1945, permitted Pétain to return to France where he stood trial for treason, was convicted and sentenced to death but his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment by de Gaulle. Laval escaped to Spain, but on French demand, was turned over to French authorities for trial. He was sentenced to death, confiscation of his properties, and national degradation. On October 14, he was executed by a firing squad.³⁷

THE FREE FRENCH MOVEMENT

The French National Committee. General Charles de Gaulle, Under Secretary of National Defense in the ill-fated Reynaud Cabinet, an advocate of mechanized warfare and staunch sup-

³⁶ *Free France*, V (January 1, 1944), pp. 39-43.

³⁷ For additional material on this section, see the issues of *Free France*, VI (July 1, 1944), pp. 25-31; and VI (October 15, 1944), p. 294.

porter of republican institutions, refused to become a party to the plot to overthrow the Republic. After the cabinet had voted to request an armistice, de Gaulle went to London determined to continue the fight against the Nazis, a resolution which he proclaimed to the world over the radio on June 18, 1940. Aided by Winston Churchill, de Gaulle called for volunteers and began to form military units under the Cross of Lorraine. In September, 1941, he organized the French National Committee to head the "Free French" movement pledged to free French territories of Axis forces and restore to the French nation its independent sovereignty.³⁸ On July 14, 1942, the name of de Gaulle's movement was changed to "Fighting France."

The French Administration in North Africa. The Allied invasion of North Africa, on November 8, 1942, opened the way for reestablishment of an anti-fascist French administration on French soil near the European theater of events. The administration in Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco was dominated by Vichy-appointed officials and in the armed forces, likewise, officers loyal to Vichy had been installed. Underground forces existed in the area but were not utilized by the Allies.³⁹ However, Allied agents made liaison with the "Chantiers de la Jeunesse," a pseudo-Vichy youth organization which aided them to prepare for the invasion. According to advice from their representatives in North Africa, Allied leaders feared that de Gaulle and his French National Committee would not be welcomed in North Africa. Hence, they sought a French leader who, they judged, would be more acceptable in that pro-Vichy atmosphere.⁴⁰

On instructions from Washington, General Eisenhower interviewed General Henri Giraud, who had recently escaped from a German prison, and secured his promise to take over French affairs in North Africa on behalf of the Allies. At the time of the invasion, however, Allied representatives found Giraud unacceptable to military and governmental leaders in the area.

³⁸ Cf. André Riveloup, *The Truth about de Gaulle* (New York: Arco, 1944), pp. 15-24; S. Ward Price, *Giraud and the African Scene* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), pp. 65-75; and R. Aglion, *The Fighting French* (New York: Holt, 1943), Ch. 6.

³⁹ A. Riveloup, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁴⁰ On this point, see W. Gallagher, *Back Door to Berlin* (New York: Doubleday, 1943), p. 123.

Hence, General Mark W. Clark, leader of the American forces, negotiated with Admiral Darlan, Commander-in-Chief of all military forces of the Vichy Government, who happened to be in Algeria at the time, to order French forces to cease firing and take over the government. After prolonged negotiation, Darlan agreed to do so on the grounds that the Germans had invaded the unoccupied zone of France and, hence (since Pétain was unable to speak for himself) as Vice Premier, authority devolved upon him. Giraud was pacified by his appointment as Commander-in-Chief of all French Military forces in North Africa.⁴¹

As head of the North African government, Darlan gave full support to the Allies. Established as High Commissioner of French North Africa under Allied authority, he created an Imperial Council, consisting of the Governors of the North African colonies, to advise him. Darlan's incumbency, however, was doomed from the start because of his affiliations with Vichy. Though his appointment was, no doubt, of military advantage to the Allies, his assassination on December 24, 1942, came as a relief to French patriots and to liberals generally. Bound by their previous pledges to Giraud, the Allies felt obligated to sponsor him as High Commissioner in Darlan's place, though it was already becoming obvious that Giraud was unpopular with French officials and people of North Africa and was, himself, uninterested in political affairs.⁴² Elected High Commissioner by the Imperial Council, Giraud held this post until June 3, 1943.

Meanwhile de Gaulle in London had taken no part in developments in North Africa, offended, perhaps, because he had not been commissioned to assume control there, and suspicious of top-ranking officials in the Allied-sponsored regime whose Vichy connections were all too obvious. De Gaulle's followers were demanding that he be given Giraud's position since Giraud was without a political following and had taken no previous part in the Free French movement. The problem for the Allies became one of fusing these two liberationist groups into a unity for the common cause. At the Casablanca Conference in January, 1943, Churchill and Roosevelt invited the two French leaders to attend and tried to get them to reach an agreement. Personal and

⁴¹ Cf. S. W. Price, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-152; and W. Gallagher, *op. cit.*, Ch. III.

⁴² Cf. W. Gallagher, *op. cit.*, p. 125; S. W. Price, *op. cit.*, p. 259; and E. J. Knapton, "Harmony in Algiers," *Current History*, V (September, 1943), pp. 50-55.

political rivalries, however, prevented settlement of the points at issue for another four months.⁴³

French Committee of National Liberation, June 3, 1943–June 2, 1944. Meeting at Algiers, finally, the two leaders agreed to join forces. A Committee of National Liberation was created, replacing the French National Committee, with de Gaulle and Giraud acting as co-chairmen. Continued rivalry between the two leaders resulted finally in a victory for de Gaulle. Giraud was forced out of the Committee and ultimately out of the army itself.⁴⁴ In April, 1944, by an ordinance of the Committee of Liberation, de Gaulle was made sole president of the Committee and Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. Offered the super-numerary position of Inspector General, Giraud preferred to retire. Thus de Gaulle emerged as sole leader of all political and military forces of the Committee of National Liberation.⁴⁵

The Provisional Consultative Assembly. First recommended by de Gaulle in a letter to Giraud on May 7, 1943, the Provisional Consultative Assembly was created by an ordinance of the Committee of National Liberation September 17, 1943, and located at Algiers. Its original membership of about eighty members was increased, in December, 1943, to 102 members, drawn from (1) the National Resistance Council in France; (2) former Parliamentary groups; (3) Resistance groups outside France; (4) General Councils of liberated departments and colonies. Organized under traditional French provisions for national legislative bodies, its functions were confined largely to giving advice on legislative proposals and passing upon the budgets.

The Purge. Begun by Darlan and carried on by Giraud, the purge of pro-Fascists and collaborationists was intensified under de Gaulle. A purge Committee was established to prosecute all suspected persons. To secure speedier action, each National Commissioner was given power to dismiss and bring to justice guilty persons in his department. In the view of the Committee of Liberation, no peace treaty was ever signed by a French government, hence, France was still at war with Germany and all Frenchmen who cooperated with her in any way were traitors. It was decided

⁴³ Cf. S. W. Price, *op. cit.*, pp. 166–196, and Leo Gershoy, "French Fight for Power," *Current History*, III (February, 1943), pp. 499–503.

⁴⁴ *Free France*, V (January 1, 1944), p. 14 ff.

⁴⁵ *Free France*, V (May 1, 1944), p. 329 ff.; and E. J. Knaption, "France Awaits the Decisive Hour," *Current History*, V (December, 1943), pp. 320–326.

that Marshal Pétain and all policy-making members of his government should be tried for treason. All empire officials who interfered with the reentry of French colonies into the war were ordered arrested but guaranteed a trial by orderly court processes. Under these decrees, Messrs. Peyroutan, Flandin, Boisson, Puchen, and many others were indicted for treason and many were put to death or sentenced to long imprisonment.⁴⁶

Foreign Relations. The foremost problem of foreign policy was recognition of the Committee by the Allies as the provisional government of France. Particularly pressing in this regard was the necessity of making arrangements with the Allied governments for the taking over of liberated areas of metropolitan France. Although Russia, Great Britain, and other nations were disposed to extend recognition, the United States seemed reluctant to do so, although early in 1944 Secretary of State Cordell Hull had conceded the willingness of Washington to allow de Gaulle to set up local administrations to maintain law and order. Elaborate plans were made by the Committee of Liberation, aided by the Assembly, for restoring republican government in the liberated areas in an ordinance passed on April 21, 1944.

By the Spring of 1944, the Committee of Liberation had succeeded in obtaining a place on the Allied Control Commission which administered the Italian Armistice and on the Allied Advisory Council which supervised Italian political questions. It had also been a party to the making of the Armistice itself. But the Committee demanded, in addition, that it should have a place on the European Advisory Council, be consulted in regard to the disposition of Germany at the Armistice, and, after the war, that it should be allotted German territory as an occupying power, and given particular consideration in any plans for the Rhineland and the Saar Valley.⁴⁷

Other Problems. Financial and military agreements were concluded with the United States and Great Britain, and an allotment of French ships from the Allied pool was made to permit welcome relief to be brought to North Africa. Revolutionists in French Syria and The Lebanon were pacified by a promise of independence. Local elections were held in freed Corsica and

⁴⁶ *Free France*, V (January 1, 1944), pp. 3-10; and V (April 1, 1944), pp. 255-257.

⁴⁷ *Loc. cit.*, V (June 15, 1944), pp. 422-427.

institutions and laws of the Third Republic were restored in that area. At an Imperial Conference held at Brazzaville in French Equatorial Africa plans were made to organize the French Empire into a Federation extending to the native peoples more representation in governmental agencies, and French citizenship in the case of certain selected groups.⁴⁸

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF THE FRENCH REPUBLIC

On June 2, 1944, on recommendation of the National Council of Resistance in France and with a favorable vote of the Provisional Consultative Assembly, the Committee of Liberation decided to adopt the title of "Provisional Government of the French Republic." Immediate recognition was extended by Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Luxembourg, and Poland but the "Big Three" withheld formal approval for the time being. The new Provisional Government ordered closing of the frontiers between French and Spanish Morocco and held up diplomatic correspondence crossing the borders until further notice. The F.F.I. (French Forces of the Interior), secret army of the Resistance movement, was brought into liaison with the General Staff of the French Army and finally included as a part of the regular army. On June 3, an ordinance was issued abolishing all Vichy decrees and governments and restoring the laws of the Third Republic in the liberated areas, and, on June 27, this provision was extended to all of metropolitan France. A regional Commissioner was appointed for Normandy who began immediately to restore local governments and law and order.⁴⁹

Operations of representatives of the Provisional Government in the field were conducted in full cooperation with Allied Chiefs although some friction developed between de Gaulle and the Washington government. As the invasion progressed, American doubts as to de Gaulle's popularity with the French people were shown to be fallacious. In consequence, an agreement was made between the United States and the Provisional Government, on

⁴⁸ See especially *Free France*, "Special Issue Number Two" for a detailed report on the Brazzaville Conference.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, VI (July 1 and 15, 1944), pp. 15-25; 50-66.

August 22, giving the latter authority over the selection of local officials in all of France.⁵⁰

On July 11, *de facto* recognition of the Provisional Government was extended by the United States. This was followed on October 23, by *de jure* recognition on the part of the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and the United States. After Paris was freed early in September, the Consultative Assembly was moved there from Algiers.

Organization of the Provisional Government. Installation of the new government in Paris raised the problem of a fusion between the "Fighting French" from North Africa and the forces of resistance within metropolitan France. In May, 1943, all forces of opposition to the Nazis in France had been unified under leadership of the National Council of Resistance. There were sixteen organizations represented within this body including eight resistance groups, six political parties and the two national labor federations (Confédération Générale du Travail, and Confédération du Travailleurs Chretien). De Gaulle was successful in bringing these two anti-Nazi political forces into union.

The President. As constituted in September, 1944, the executive branch of the government consisted of a President, a cabinet composed of twenty-two ministers or "commissioners," each at the head of a department of administration, and twelve secretaries-general in charge of certain important departments under a minister. As both nominal and actual executive head, the President, General Charles de Gaulle, exercised all of the powers customarily belonging to such an office, except appointment of members of the cabinet—these were co-opted. The President exercised general supervision over governmental affairs, appointed political heads of the various public offices, received and sent diplomatic missions, controlled military affairs, and executed decisions of the cabinet.

The Cabinet. Broadened in April, 1944, to include two Communists and a Radical Socialist, the Committee of Liberation was expanded again in Paris to include six additional representatives of the National Council of Resistance. Thus the new cabinet

⁵⁰ Cf. L. K. Rosinger, "Political Issues Unresolved as Allied Armies Advance," *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, XXIII (June 16, 1944); and W. N. Hadsell, "Liberated France Moves Towards Fourth Republic," *loc. cit.*, XXIII (September 1, 1944), p. 2.

was made representative of all shades of prevalent opinion with the Resistance group heavily emphasized. Decrees and ordinances (the only form of law-making possible until a new Parliament was elected) were framed and promulgated by the cabinet. General power over policy-making rested in its hands. Individually, the ministers were the heads of the administrative departments of the government. Neither the cabinet as a whole nor individual ministers were responsible to the Assembly in the sense that they held their offices at the pleasure of that body.

The Legislature. The Provisional Consultative Assembly organized by the French Committee of National Liberation was carried over into the new regime with very few changes except in membership. In order to give additional representation to Resistance groups in France, the Assembly was enlarged to 248 members. Of this number, 148 were assigned to Metropolitan Resistance and apportioned among its various groups according to size, 60 representatives were given to the two Houses of the former Parliament to be chosen by the 80 members who voted against conferring dictatorial powers on Pétain, 28 were from Corsica and the overseas Resistance, and 12 from the General Councils of the Overseas Territories.⁵¹

In other respects the Assembly remained substantially as it was. The limited scope of its powers was recognized both by the government and by the Assembly itself, it being generally agreed that this body could hardly function as a Parliament since its members did not derive their mandates from the people. Provision was made by an ordinance of April 21, 1944 for the steps to be taken in setting up a duly elected Parliamentary body. Under provisions of the ordinance, women were enfranchised. Municipal and departmental elections were held in May and June, 1945, and elections for the Constituent Assembly took place in October.

The Judiciary. Subject to the purge, the ordinary courts continued to function under the Provisional Government. However, just as the Vichy regime organized special courts to suppress dissident elements, so the new government took steps after liberation to (1) abolish all governmental organs of the counter-

⁵¹ For the text of the Ordinance of October 11, 1944, modifying the composition, procedures, and powers of the Provisional Consultative Assembly, see *Free France*, VII (January 1, 1945), pp. 48-51.

revolution, including courts; and (2) establish special courts to aid in the purge of Fascist elements.

The judicial instruments formed for this purpose included (1) a High Court of Justice with a presiding judge, two associates, and 24 jurors chosen by lot by the Consultative Assembly. Attached to this court was an Attorney-General and two prosecutors, an investigating committee consisting of five judges, and six other persons appointed by the Assembly. Its function was to try high officials of Vichy and their accomplices. (2) Courts of Justice composed of five judges assisted by juries drawn from lists of patriotic persons were also created. These courts were located in each of the Court of Appeals districts and were given the powers of assize courts. Government Commissioners were appointed to each court to act as prosecutors. (3) Special sections of the Courts of Justice consisting of five members were established to try persons accused of "national unworthiness" i.e., participating officially or unofficially in activities favorable to Vichy or to Germany. Penalties involved loss of civil rights and dismissal from the government, business, or professional connections.⁵²

Departments and Communes. By the ordinance of April 21, 1944, arrangements were made to install temporary local governments in the liberated areas of France pending the calling of popular elections. Departmental and Communal Councils and their officers existing prior to 1939 were restored to power except where evidences of collaboration were found, in which case the guilty officials were dismissed and special delegates appointed by the prefects. Prewar communal boundaries were restored. All communal assemblies appointed by Vichy were dissolved. Deceased communal and departmental officials were replaced by new ones elected by the councils. Prefects and deputy prefects were appointed by the Minister of the Interior.

In liberated Paris, a provisional administrative assembly was temporarily established, members of which were appointed by the cabinet, on advice of the Paris Committee of Liberation. It consisted of 85 members—28 from the Paris Committee of Liberation and 57 from Paris arrondissements. The General Council of the department of the Seine was set up by the same method. This body was composed of 133 members, including the 85 members of the Paris provisional assembly, 42 from the cantons, and 6 from

⁵² *Ibid*, VI (Oct. 1, 1944), pp. 254-256; VI (Nov. 1, 1944), pp. 349-350; VI (Dec. 15, 1944), p. 483.

the largest groups of the Resistance Movements. In the elections held in May, 1945, the voters elected 90 members to the Parisian Communal Council of which 39 were Communists and Socialists. Elections of Communal Councils were held all over France in May.⁵³

Regions. In July, 1944, France was divided into regional commissariats, each under a regional commissioner. The latter officials were given general power of administration and supervision over these areas, which included in each case several departments. Regional boundaries were fixed by the Minister of the Interior. Exceptional powers could be conferred on the commissioners in case communication was cut off with the central government. All regional areas and departmental officials created by Vichy were abolished. Regional Commissioners were appointed in Normandy and the Mediterranean areas immediately and in other sections as they were freed. Thus the work of reconstruction was expedited.⁵⁴

The Resistance Movement. Dissolution of political parties, labor unions, and secret societies by the Pétain regime and demobilization of the armed forces in 1940 found many patriotic persons from all walks of life willing to give up their social prejudices to cooperate in a common effort against the enemy. Driven underground by repressive tactics but given increased support by the disillusioned people of France, these oppositionist elements began to form themselves into cohesive groups. Among the first to organize were "Liberation," "Combat," "Franc-Tireur," "Socialist Action" and the "Popular Front." These were composed mostly of military, intellectual, socialist, and Communist elements. Additional underground units included "Organization Civil et Militaire," "Ceux de la Résistance," "Libération Nord," "Libération Sud," and "Patriotic Youth." These were joined in time by organizations of the old political parties including Radical Socialists, Popular Democrats, and Republican Federation in addition to the Socialist and Communist groups. Labor union elements coalesced into two principal bodies, the Confédération Générale du Travail and Confédération du Travailleurs Chretien.

A National Resistance Council was formed in May, 1943, em-

⁵³ *Ibid.*, V (May 1, 1944), p. 338 ff.; VI (November 15, 1944), pp. 373-374; VII (May 15, 1944), pp. 495-497.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, VI (August 15, 1944), p. 152; VI (September 1 and 15, 1944), pp. 177-184.

bodily these and a few other minor elements. Following the signing of separate agreements with de Gaulle in late 1942 by some of the groups, the Council later declared its support of the Free French movement and was given representation on the National Committee of Liberation in Algiers. As popular resistance to Vichy assumed landslide proportions in 1943-1944, the Council, aided by many young men escaped from the labor draft, organized armed underground units which engaged in large scale sabotage against the enemy. Eventually these forces were organized into semi-military units under a Committee of Military Action of the Council and did yeoman service in assisting the Allied invasion. Under the Provisional Government, the Resistance Council took a dominant place, being accorded large representation in national and local governments and, through its national, departmental, and local committees, controlling and guiding the organization and functioning of the new government.

Political Parties. France found herself in the throes of a social revolution. Pre-war social and political leaders were largely discredited. As a result of the victory of the resistance groups, the working class assumed a dominant position and its leaders occupied many of the key positions. The political parties reflected this situation. Parties of the Right lost caste as a consequence of their prewar records and for a time seemed permanently eliminated as political factors. However, after a period of extreme disfavor they began slowly to regain popular support. Meanwhile parties of the Left dominated the scene. Center parties such as the Radical Socialists and Popular Democrats were reduced to small minority groups in the Assembly because of their prewar appeasement policies. Of the parties in existence in 1939, only the Communists came out of the war with increased power and prestige due to their contributions to the resistance movement.

The Popular Republican Movement, radical but evolutionary in its aims, with strong Catholic support and no taint of prewar disloyalty, capitalized on its resistance background and assumed a leading position. The labor unions, working through the National Front (Communist) and the Movement of National Liberation (Socialist), took a dominant position in politics. Basing their stand on the "Resistance Charter," of March 15, 1944, which was supported by all resistance groups, the unions called for reestablishment of free trade unions and collective bar-

gaining, national planning in consultation with labor, the nationalization of monopolies, natural resources, and insurance companies, and socialization of large banks. Aware of the dangers to freedom of bureaucratic centralization, however, they demanded that labor and consumer representatives have a voice in policy-making in the new socialized enterprises.⁵⁵

The Purge. In addition to criminal action taken against collaborators, an ordinance was passed June 27, 1944, purging the administrative services of collaborators. According to the degree of their guilt, they could be suspended, transferred, reduced in rank, retired, or dismissed, their pension canceled and decorations removed. Following this, an ordinance of August 26, 1944, provided that all collaborators convicted of "national unworthiness" could be penalized by loss of civil rights, exclusion from business and professional positions, or prohibited from living in certain areas of France or the colonies. Any person holding an office under Vichy or participating in any collaborationist organization could be subjected to this form of punishment if convicted. Some of the more zealous exponents of the purge advocated punishment of defeatists as well as collaborators on the grounds that the nation must be purified of all political traitors. As a result of purge activities, the special courts were handling several hundred cases a day by November, 1944, and it was estimated that there were at least 100,000 persons subject to purge laws throughout the country. Profits of business firms made in collaboration with the Nazis were confiscated. Prosecuted with great fervor at first, the drive to purge pro-Vichyites gradually lost impetus.⁵⁶

The Press. A purge of the press was instituted by the Provisional Government. On May 5, 1944, the National Committee submitted a decree providing that newspapers published in France since the Armistice were to be confiscated. Collaborationist editors were dismissed from the journalistic profession and

⁵⁵ Cf. Immanuel Mounier, "The Structures of Liberation," *Commonweal*, XLII (May 18, 1945), pp. 112-113; Paul Vignaux, "Unrest in France," *Commonweal*, XLII (May 4, 1945), pp. 62-64; also "The French Labor Movement," *Commonweal*, XLI (December 15, 1944), pp. 222-224; "Right vs. Center vs. Left in France," *Scholastic*, XLVI (March 26, 1945), pp. 4-5; E. J. Knapton, "The Balance Sheet in France," *Current History*, VIII (March, 1945), pp. 230-232.

⁵⁶ Cf. "Inside France," *Bulletin of International News*, XXI (October 28, 1944), pp. 894-895; E. J. Knapton, *op. cit.*, pp. 230-231; and *Free France*, VI (October 1, 1944), pp. 256-258, VI (November 1, 1944), pp. 425-426, and VII (March 1, 1945), pp. 251-253.

property of their newspapers was confiscated. Patriotic newspapers were allowed to resume publication under government supervision. All news agencies were subjected to requisition by the government. All fascist trade unions of the press were dissolved. Under the Minister of Information, national and regional press committees were created to supervise the press. The aim, the Ministry explained, was to prevent recurrence of a press subsidized by the great monopolies or government departments, thus checking recurrence of the great abuses of this type that had existed in the prewar situation. Otherwise, no attempts were made to muzzle the press.⁵⁷

Reconstruction of the Army. When the Provisional Government moved to Paris, it already had under its control substantial forces from North Africa, armed and accoutered mostly by the United States. Several French divisions participated in the Italian campaign and a considerable French force landed with the Allies in Normandy. On the other hand, the F.F.I., organized by the French Council of Resistance, had attained formidable numbers by the Spring of 1944, and took a large part in behind-the-lines activities in the Allied invasion of France. These troops together with guerrilla forces called "Maquis" and "Republican Militia" considered themselves the nucleus of the new army of France, and were reluctant to give up their arms. By order of the Provisional Government, the F.F.I. was incorporated into the regular French forces and the irregulars required to disband.

Conscription was reinstituted and various classes of young men called up for training. French military authorities estimated that France would have a postwar standing army of about 500,000 men, as against 700,000 before the war. The pace of reconstruction of the military forces, however, depended considerably upon the amount of materials available from the United States.⁵⁸ The Navy consisted largely of the remaining units of the prewar French fleet brought together from various parts of the world. Estimates placed the size of this force at about 300 ships and 60,000 men.⁵⁹

Economic Reconstruction. As a result of the occupation and in-

⁵⁷ *Free France*, V (June 15, 1944), pp. 417-418; and VI (August 1, 1944), pp. 104-106.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, VII (February 1, 1945), pp. 129-132.

⁵⁹ *Governments of the Major Foreign Powers* (West Point: U. S. Military Academy, 1945), p. 75.

vasion, France was left impoverished and enfeebled. Chief difficulties were lack of transport through destruction of railways and bridges and loss of shipping through the attrition of war. Lack of transport caused shortages of coal for fuel and power to run industrial machinery and lack of food in the cities, although adequate supplies were available in rural sections. Shortages of other essentials of industry were also apparent. Owing to lack of fuel and of machinery, many factories were forced to remain closed, thus increasing unemployment. Finances were in a chaotic state. Measures of reconstruction included rebuilding of bridges and repair of highways and railway rolling stock. Progress was necessarily slow. About 600,000 tons of old French ships and some Liberty ships from the United States were obtained to try to increase stocks of fuel and food by importations from abroad. A census of agriculture was taken, Vichy measures abolished, and steps made to encourage increases in production.

Demands of labor for increased wages to meet the inflationary situation were met by raising wages about 30 per cent and providing for unemployment compensation. Attempts were made to check inflation by calling in all old money, making an inventory of fortunes and deducting all war profits by a national equalization tax, refinancing government liabilities, and inaugurating a new liberation loan.⁶⁰ Credits totaling about \$1,372,000,000 were extended to the French Government for reconstruction purposes by the United States. Five leading banks (among them the Bank of France), 30 large insurance companies, assorted gas and electric concerns and some coal deposits were nationalized, with compensation to the owners. But efforts to halt the vicious circle of rising prices and wages had not succeeded by the beginning of 1947.

Foreign Policies. In the realm of foreign policy three main objectives were sought by the Provisional Government: (1) reconstitution of France as a great power; (2) security of a type that would guarantee the safety of France in the future; and (3) participation in a world peace organization. As regards (1) the problems were to (a) overcome the stigma of defeat, humiliating surrender, and collaboration; (b) rearm and (c) regain France's former position as a primary power in the councils of Europe and the world. Some progress was made in securing

⁶⁰ See the issues of *Free France* from July 1, 1944 *et seq.* for additional information on this topic.

these objectives. Alsace-Lorraine was restored to France after its reconquest by the Allies, and the southern part of the Saar Valley as well as a large section of Germany proper allotted to France for occupation. A French representative was included in the Allied Control Council for Germany and also on the Berlin Kommandatur, with jurisdiction over a district of Berlin and a voice in its overall affairs. With the abolition of the European Advisory Council by the Allies at the Potsdam Conference of August 3, 1945, France was given one of the five places on the Council of Foreign Ministers which replaced it. Though no provisions were made at the Potsdam Conference regarding Germany's western frontiers, the French government advocated separation of the Rhineland from Germany and its administration under international controls.

In December, 1944, France concluded a twenty-year pact of alliance with the U.S.S.R., and projected a similar treaty with Great Britain. The Provisional Government under de Gaulle aimed at establishing a western European bloc of powers, also, to include Luxembourg, Holland, and Belgium but the opposition of Russia and the powerful French Communist party blocked this plan. Progress in achieving world peace was made when France accepted a place as one of the five great powers with a permanent position on the Security Council of the United Nations peace organization framed at San Francisco.

The Empire. Due to Allied aid in restoring French Indochina to the Provisional Government, the prewar Empire was virtually intact at the end of the war. But it did not escape the postwar revolutionary stirrings that developed in the colonies of other European powers. Violent nationalist outbreaks against French occupying forces in Syria and Lebanon in June, 1945, led to British intervention; the French were forced to withdraw their troops and to make good on their war-time pledges of independence. Serious rioting by Algerian nationalists was put down in May, 1945, with much bloodshed, but eleven of the imprisoned ringleaders were elected to the French Constituent Assembly in 1946 to press for an autonomous Algerian republic within the French union. The Provisional Government sought to allay colonial unrest by proposing reforms which would bring the advanced colonies into a free and equal union with the mother country. In response to continued unrest in French Indochina, the government on March 4, 1946, agreed to extend virtu-

ally complete independence to the newly formed native republic of Viet Nam. Nevertheless a formidable revolt against French authority in Indochina broke out towards the end of that year.⁶¹ The French leasehold on Kwangchowan was returned to China in 1945.

THE CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

An ordinance of August 17, 1945, set October 21 as the date for choosing delegates for the National Constituent Assembly. This body was composed of 586 members of whom 522 were chosen from districts in metropolitan France and 64 from the overseas territories. Voting was by party lists, giving some recognition to proportional representation. In addition to choosing delegates, the voters had to decide whether the new body should function as a legislature as well as a constituent assembly and whether the power of the assembly to overthrow the president should be restricted. In the campaign that followed, the Communist Party favored a strong, unicameral legislature and an executive branch subordinate to it, hoping by this means to pave the way for radical reforms. The Socialists favored nationalization of large-scale industry but wavered in its attitude of collaboration with the Communists. The Popular Republican Movement was willing to cooperate with the other parties to some extent on their social program but tended to support de Gaulle in his desire for a strong executive, and favored state support of the church's educational program.

The result of the election was favorable to the Communists who won 151 seats to 150 for the Popular Republican Movement (M.R.P.) and 139 for the Socialists. Both of the questions submitted to popular vote were answered affirmatively.

De Gaulle Resigns. On November 6, de Gaulle surrendered his powers to the newly elected Assembly and on November 13, he was reelected Provisional President by unanimous vote. De Gaulle's failure to form a government, due to his refusal to grant the Communist demand for the portfolios of Foreign Affairs, War, and Interior, caused his resignation again, on November 16. The Communists then proposed Félix Gouin, Socialist, for

⁶¹ On this subject, see especially *Free France*, Special Issue No. 2, "French Colonial Policy in North Africa"; and Special Issue No. 3, "French Relations with Syria and the Lebanon."

President but the Assembly reelected de Gaulle by an overwhelming vote. The resulting split between the Communists and the M.R.P. was partially overcome by a temporary agreement to form a government. In the new Cabinet, the seats were equally divided between the three parties. The truce was short-lived. Quarrels ensued between de Gaulle and the Assembly over the former's financial and military policies and the General's open dissatisfaction with the radical features of the Assembly's draft proposals for the new constitution. These culminated on January 22, 1946, in a "definitive" resignation of de Gaulle and his "strategic" retirement from public life. Gouin was then elected President with the support of the Communists. Under Gouin a three-party coalition was formed again but de Gaulle's supporters were dropped from the Cabinet.

On March 4, 1946, the draft constitution was submitted to popular vote. Largely a Communist-sponsored project, the new instrument omitted provision for an upper chamber and made the executive subservient to a single-house Parliament. De Gaulle's campaign in opposition was successful and the voters rejected the constitution by over a million votes. Elections were then held on June 2 for a new Constituent Assembly. The results indicated a shift towards de Gaulle's viewpoint. The M.R.P. by winning 160 seats became the largest single party. The Communists dropped to second place with 145 seats, while the Socialists, with 115 seats, lost heavily. Gouin then resigned and Georges Bidault, M.R.P. candidate, was chosen Provisional President.

Constitution Adopted. Much encouraged by the election results, de Gaulle renewed his campaign for a strong executive and a bicameral legislature of co-equal powers. The Constituent Assembly made only slight concessions to his views in drafting a revised version of the Constitution and de Gaulle again called upon the voters to repudiate it. Although about 32 per cent of the electorate failed to vote, the new Constitution was approved by a small majority in a referendum held October 13.

Parliamentary Elections. In accordance with the new Constitution, elections for the National Assembly, or first chamber of Parliament, were held on November 10. In these elections the Communists made substantial gains, the M.R.P. held its own, the Socialists lost heavily, and the extreme Rightist groups won a number of seats. Standings of the principal parties in the new National Assembly and in the preceding Constituent Assembly

(in parentheses) were: Communists, 163 (148); M.R.P., 160 (160); Socialists, 93 (120); Radicals and allied parties, 59 (59); Republican Party of Liberty and Rightist affiliates, 42 (34). There were 619 Deputies in the new National Assembly—574 from France and Algeria, which politically is considered part of metropolitan France, and 45 from the colonies. In the balloting on November 24 for an electoral college to choose the second chamber, the Council of the Republic, the parties emerged in very much the same relative positions that they secured in the first chamber. Election of the 315 members of the Council of the Republic took place on December 8 with members of the electoral college, the National Assembly, and the departmental councils gathering in the capitals of their respective departments to join in the voting. The Council of the Republic was constituted along almost exactly the same party lines as the National Assembly.

Georges Bidault, the M.R.P. leader who had held the three key posts of Provisional President, Premier, and Minister of Foreign Affairs, now stepped out of the latter two positions to permit the new National Assembly to fill them. The Communists, as the largest party, put up Maurice Thorez as their candidate for Premier but he was unable to muster a majority of votes. A political deadlock ensued which was broken on December 12 when the veteran Socialist leader Léon Blum was persuaded to emerge from retirement. He received 575 of the 590 votes cast for the Premiership. Blum selected a Cabinet made up entirely of Socialists to carry on with the consent of both the Communists and M.R.P. until the election of a President and the establishment of the first constitutional Cabinet of the Fourth Republic.

FOURTH REPUBLIC INAUGURATED

The new Constitution went into effect on December 24, when the Council of the Republic convened for the first time. De Gaulle announced that he would not be a candidate for the Presidency. The party regime set up by the Constitution could not solve the country's problems, he insisted, and the President would be forced "to preside, powerless, over the powerlessness of the State." Consequently Vincent Auriol, Socialist chairman of the National Assembly, was elected the first President of the

Fourth Republic by a joint session of both chambers of Parliament on January 16, 1947. He selected Paul Ramadier to form a new Cabinet.

In spite of de Gaulle's objections, the new constitution conspicuously displayed the marks of its radical origin. A long Bill of Rights, after reaffirming the Rights of Man of the Declaration of Rights of 1789, proclaims the right of all to work, to join unions, to participate in collective bargaining through representatives, to strike, and to social security. All public utilities, the Constitution asserts, must become public property. Every person has the right to free education and to non-discrimination for racial and other reasons.

Parliament consists of two chambers: The National Assembly and the Council of the Republic. The former is made up of deputies elected by universal direct suffrage on a territorial basis, the latter of representatives chosen in large part by commercial and departmental councils. The membership of the Council is limited to not more than 320 and is renewable one-half at a time. Details regarding terms, eligibility, and mode of election are to be governed by statute.

The lawmaking power is vested in the National Assembly. The Council may examine and object to bills passed by the lower house but cannot prevent their being enacted into law, over its objection, by an absolute majority. Bills may be introduced in the National Assembly by the Cabinet, or members of either house. The President of the Republic may demand that the National Assembly reconsider a bill which has been passed and submitted to him but cannot refuse to promulgate it if the chamber insists upon it.

The President of the Republic is elected by Parliament (the two houses sitting together) for a term of seven years. He is eligible for one additional term only. Though broad powers are nominally vested in him, Article 38 states specifically that: "Every act of the President of the Republic must be countersigned by the President of the Council of Ministers and by a Minister." In fact, therefore, the real powers of government are exercised by the Cabinet.

As regards the Cabinet, the Premier is designated by the President of the Republic "at the opening of each legislative session" (Article 45). The Premier then submits his program to the National Assembly. If approved by an absolute majority, he then

selects the members of his Cabinet. Article 48 makes the ministers continuously responsible to the National Assembly both for the general policy of the Cabinet and for their personal acts. The fall of the Cabinet can be brought about by either a vote of want of confidence or a vote of censure if secured by an absolute majority of the lower house. On the other hand, the National Assembly can be dissolved only after two Ministerial crises have occurred within a period of eighteen months.

From the foregoing, it is clear that French postwar constitution makers have duplicated in large part the mistakes of the Third Republic which led to disaster. The supremacy of the lower house is carefully safeguarded and in fact is greatly increased through the weakening of the upper chamber. The power of the President of the Republic to force reconsideration of a measure would seem to be not much more than a gesture. The limitation on the power of the Premier to force a dissolution of the National Assembly certainly renders his power far less effective than that of the British Prime Minister. The danger of the executive becoming the creature of the lower house will be difficult to avoid.

Besides setting up a High Court of Justice to try ministers for crimes and misdemeanors, the new Constitution creates a Constitutional Committee to review acts of Parliament to determine whether they are consistent with the Constitution. An Economic Council passes upon all bills of an economic character and must be consulted by the Cabinet in regard to national planning. The newly created French Union links all French territories together in unity, extends equal rights to colonials, and provides for a common government.

RECENT TRENDS

Ramadier's three-party coalition (Communists, Socialists, and Popular Republicans) proved internally unstable. Trying desperately to keep the lid on wages and prices, Ramadier sought also to prevent dissolution of the French Empire, particularly through the defection of Indochina. His efforts were weakened, however, through undercover Communist opposition which later broke out into open contention against the government. Though opposed to Ramadier's wage-freezing policies, the Communists refused to resign from the Cabinet. Finally in May, 1947, Rama-

dier expelled them and received Assembly approval for the remaining two-party coalition.

Forced into open opposition, the Communists thereupon used their key positions in the unions to foment labor unrest and strikes for higher wages. Meantime, inflation and the black market were encouraged by war-created scarcities and by the great drought in the summer of 1947. The Marshall Plan, offering aid to those European states willing to cooperate, compelled Moscow to show its hand. Organization of the Cominform, in September, 1947, indicated the desperate purpose of the parent Communist Party in Russia and its offshoots in all European countries to prevent the spread of American influence and power through western Europe. But by these very acts, the Communists alienated many people in France and a heavy reaction set in against the extreme Left. In the October elections, the M.R.P. and Socialist parties lost heavily, the Communists made no gains, but de Gaulle's Party of the Reunion and its allies received nearly 40 per cent of the total popular vote. Since these results were in municipal elections, their ominous consequences could not be translated into votes in Parliament but they warned of possible disaster in the near future. Widespread strikes and labor disorders marked the attempt of the Communists to discredit the government and to defeat the Marshall Plan. When Ramadier failed to stem the rising labor revolt, he resigned and his place was taken by Robert Schuman, erstwhile Finance Minister, without any substantial changes in the coalition. The stern measures taken by the new Premier brought an end to the uprisings which were not zealously supported by the bulk of the working class. Devaluation of the franc and other stringent money measures helped to check inflation, encouraged exports, and stabilized conditions. Emergency American aid plus the promise of more to come and the prospect of more plentiful crops definitely killed the hopes of the Kremlin that France would go Communist. And Foreign Secretary Bevin's speech advocating formation of a western bloc of Marshall Plan nations indicated the possibility of still closer ties between France, Britain, and the United States.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AGLION, R., *The Fighting French* (New York: Holt, 1943). Describes the early days of the de Gaulle movement.

- BROGAN, D. W., *French Personalities and Problems* (New York, Knopf, 1947). Gives an interesting picture of contemporary figures in France.
- Constitution of the French Republic*. (New York: French Press and Information Service, 1946.) A pamphlet containing the new constitution.
- DORGOT, J., *France Is Divided* (New York: Transatlantic, 1946). The story of the German occupation.
- FERNAND-LAURENT, J. C., *Gallic Charter* (New York: Little, Brown, & Co., 1944). A revealing account of the conspiracy that overthrew France in 1940 from the viewpoint of a member of Parliament.
- GALLAGHER, W., *Back Door to Berlin* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1943). An American correspondent's version of the Allied invasion of North Africa.
- GERAUD, ANDRÉ, *The Gravediggers of France* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1944). Gives the inside story of those responsible for the collapse of France.
- DE KERILLIS, H., *I Accuse de Gaulle* (New York: Harcourt, 1946). Attacks de Gaulle and his Free French movement.
- HERZOG, W., *From Drefus to Pétain* (New York: Creative Age, 1947). An excellent account of French politics through the Third Republic to the Vichy regime.
- LORRAINE, J., *Behind the Battle of France* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943). Tr. by Gerard Hopkins. Clearly shows the relation of the military to the political issues in the German seduction of France.
- MARCHAL, L., *Vichy: Two Years of Deception* (New York: Macmillan, 1943). Critical but informative.
- MICAUD, CHARLES A., "The Launching of the Fourth French Republic," Chapter IV, pp. 292-307, in David Fellman, Ed., *Post-War Governments of Europe* (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publ. Co., 1946).
- MILLAR, G. R., *Waiting in the Night* (New York: Doubleday, 1946). A first-hand account of the French Maquis.
- PENDAR, K., *Adventure in Diplomacy* (Toronto: Dodd, 1945). Treats of the dealings of the United States with the French in North Africa.
- PRICE, S. W., *Giraud and the African Scene* (New York: Macmillan, 1944). Very interestingly describes Giraud's course up to the Giraud-de Gaulle controversy in North Africa.
- SIEGFRIED, ANDRÉ, *France: A Study in Nationality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930). Standard and authoritative on French character.
- TISSIER, P., *The Government of Vichy* (London: Harrap, 1942). Critical but complete and first-hand information.

GERMANY

Germany's political systems during the last century and a half have all been of supreme importance to the course of world events and, at the same time, have exhibited special characteristics distinguishing them from the outstanding types of governments and politics elsewhere in the world. The unification of Germany in 1871 produced a system dominated mainly by the King of Prussia. Germany's experiment with the Republic at the end of World War I, characterized by a multiplicity of parties, with cabinets serving several masters, ended with Hitler's Cabinet of 1933 which was the twenty-first since the drafting of the Weimar Constitution of 1919. In fact, the Republican structure was increasingly weakened after 1925 by lack of faith in the Republican government and by the active hostility of powerful groups like the Junker landholders, great industrialists, and the rising Communist and Nazi parties. Hitler's dictatorship was the third major experiment in totalitarianism, following those formed by Stalin and then Mussolini, in Europe. There is simply no comparison between the political and constitutional practices of the various German regimes and the brand of politics that has been practiced in Great Britain and the United States. The Imperial government of prewar Germany and the Weimar experiment were featured by the insistence of the numerous parties on the ideological differences separating them from each other. Hitler's totalitarianism, on the other hand, violently abolished all these ideological differences with its insistence on "One people, one nation, one leader!"

World War II left the erstwhile powerful German state prostrate under the heel of its conquerors. German territory was divided among the four occupying powers—Russia, Great Britain, the United States, and France—and no national German government existed. The victors quarreled among themselves over what to do with Germany, and each in his own zone strove to build it into a military, economic, and cultural outpost of his

own nation. Rich territories in the east were given, by agreement between the allies, to Poland. In the west, Germany's chief industrial centers were in the hands of the Anglo-American-French allies. The indications were that Germany would be under allied occupation for many years to come, split into spheres of influence with Russia dominating the eastern, and the western allies the western, parts of the country. What is the pattern of development which has led the German people into this impasse?

GERMANY'S POSITION IN EUROPE

Germany's destiny has placed her in the center of Europe where it has been her fate to be situated between the rapidly increasing Slavic population of the east, and the French, Belgians and Dutch to the west, backed by Great Britain and the United States, who partly obstructed her egress to the open sea. By dint of great exertions, her statesmen finally carved out a patrimony in 1871, somewhat smaller in size than the State of Texas, only to have it pared down after World War I to a domain of about 181,688 square miles, containing, in 1939, over 69,000,000 people. Checked in the east, west, and north. Germany's pathway of expansion has ever been over Austria and down the Danube to the Balkans and the Near East. But here, also, Germany's ambitious plans ran afoul the Russians, Turks, Italians, French, and British already intrenched in those regions.

In the eyes of leaders of the Reich, Germany as the most powerful state in Europe, not including Russia, and with a growing, highly efficient and cultured population operating an industrial plant of ever-increasing productivity, was blocked by her jealous neighbors from achieving her natural development as a nation. Her frequent military ventures in modern times have been directed towards breaking out of the deadly ring which—according to her nationalist ideology—threatened to throttle her, conquering her enemies, and ruling central Europe with an iron hand. Fearing engulfment by the rising tide of Slavs, encouraged by past military successes, and proud of Germany's acknowledged military prowess, German statesmen dreamed of supremacy in Europe for the Reich and schemed to bring it about. Peace was a time of preparation for sallies against the enclosing walls. *Lebensraum* meant not only more land, yielding a surplus of raw ma-

terials and foodstuffs, but space for that freedom of action as a Great Power to which Germany, as Europe's foremost State, considered herself entitled.¹

In 1940, not only hegemony of Europe but domination of the world seemed within Germany's grasp. Fundamentally, the essential motivation to conquest was not more space for an expanding population. Germany's living space, in terms of population per square mile, and of available arable land, was much greater than that of her smaller neighbors, Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland, whose peoples, diligent in industry and trade, had achieved high standards of living. The German people could have followed their example, but, rather, chose to follow the course of war and conquest dictated by pride and arrogance.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The German Empire. Bismarck's efforts to unite the congeries of German states existing prior to 1870 finally culminated in the German Empire of 1871-1918. It was governed by a German Emperor who as King of Prussia exercised absolute authority over the bulk of Germany's people, and as Emperor wielded wide powers over military and foreign affairs; and a parliament in which the upper house, composed of representatives of the states, dominated over legislative matters. The people of this powerful and prosperous state obediently followed the leadership of their ruling military elite into World War I.²

World War I and the Weimar Constitution. Defeated at the end of four years of war by the Western Allies, William II abdicated. The military clique and the Junker class of Prussia withdrew temporarily from the seats of power. A Provisional Government was established and a Constituent Assembly, elected by universal suffrage, convened at Weimar to draw up a new constitution.³

¹ Herman Rauschnig, "Hitler Could Not Stop," *Foreign Affairs*, XVIII (October, 1939), pp. 6-8.

² For further reading on the government of Germany under the Empire, see F. K. Kruger, *Government and Politics of the German Empire* (New York: World Book, 1915).

³ For an excellent survey of the German Revolution and the Weimar Convention, see K. Loewenstein, "Government and Politics in Germany" in J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), pp. 336-337, and Ch. VII.

A coalition of Centrists, Democrats, and Social Democrats (moderate Socialists) took control of the Assembly and proceeded to draft a new constitution. Their handiwork, given form by Hugo Preuss, the so-called "father of the constitution," reflects the necessary compromises involved in adjustments to the views of socialists, liberals, nationalists, and states rights advocates. Provisions for greater powers to be concentrated in the national government and full participation by the people in elections, popular legislation, and the choosing of legislative representatives, marked the trend towards centralization and democracy.

In the federal system set up by the Weimar Constitution, the central government was granted substantial powers, yet the eighteen member states retained considerable autonomy. Legislative authority was vested in a bicameral legislature consisting of an upper house (the Reichsrat) of about seventy members representing the states roughly on the basis of one member for every million of population. The lower house (the Reichstag), composed of over five hundred members, was representative of the German people as a whole. By far the most powerful of the two bodies, it controlled the cabinet and enacted legislation subject to a suspensive veto by the Reichsrat. Executive power was given to a President elected by popular vote for a seven-year term and with indefinite reeligibility. The Cabinet, which actually exercised the President's powers under a strong leader, the Chancellor, was made responsible to Parliament. Under emergency conditions, however, the President, owing to his strong position as an elected leader and his power to dissolve the Reichstag and dismiss the Cabinet, was able to wrest the initiative from Cabinet and Parliament.⁴

Causes of Failure of the Weimar System. Among the more important causes for failure of the Republic, the following may be listed: (1) the Constitution was framed by liberals and socialists but later in the twenties a shift of popular votes to the conserva-

⁴ On this point, compare A. Brecht, *Prelude to Silence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944), pp. 44-50; and F. Neumann, *Behemoth* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), pp. 27-28. Brecht stresses the point that Hindenburg used the decree powers reluctantly and was faithful to the constitution. Neumann contends that he used his powers in a partisan fashion and by 1930 had practically taken over the legislative powers of Parliament. Both blame the weaknesses of the constitution for the tendency towards dictatorship of the executive. For a copy of the Weimar Constitution, see N. Hill and H. Stoke, *The Background of European Governments* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1940), p. 381.

tive parties strengthened the groups in the Reichstag and the Cabinet which were anti-republican; (2) the civil service and the army were never favorable to the new system and in many instances actually worked against it; (3) post-war inflation followed by the great depression provoked popular discontent, especially among members of the middle classes who tended to blame the Republican government for their woes and listened to subversive arguments of the National Socialists; (4) class conflicts intensified by the economic crises were exaggerated by the use of proportional representation and consequent formation of many small, "splinter" parties which were reluctant to compromise and by their dissident tactics weakened the Cabinet and forced the President to take independent action; (5) use of the decree power by the President under Article 48 of the Constitution gradually undermined the popular foundations of the regime by forcing Cabinets more and more under presidential control until finally President Hindenburg was making and breaking them without regard for the support given them in the Reichstag; (6) free speech and press and the lax attitude of socialist and liberal parties supporting the republic permitted disloyal elements to increase their strength; (7) backed by large-scale business and the army, the National Socialists attacked the Weimar Republic, blaming it for the Versailles Treaty and the depression; (8) unfamiliarity of the German people with parliamentary government and their tendency to look to strong leaders for guidance led to crisis government and the suspension of constitutional provisions and guarantees followed by dictatorship.

NATIONAL SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Between September, 1930, and March, 1933, the National Socialist Party raised its representation in the Reichstag from 12 to a total of 288. Hindenburg's reelection by a 53 per cent popular vote in April, 1932, confirmed him in his policy of maintaining presidential cabinets. This was made necessary, in his view, by violent popular swings to Right and Left, making formation of coalition cabinets with majority support almost an impossibility. Yet he was aware of the fact that his reelection was secured through support of the Socialists, and that he was expected to continue in his opposition to accession of the National Socialists

to power. Suddenly on May 30, the Bruening Cabinet resigned. Hindenburg's motives for the dismissal of Bruening remain obscure. The dismissal was not necessary, for the Cabinet had not been defeated in the Reichstag. Whether Hindenburg's act was due to pressure upon him by his conservative friends because of Bruening's proposal to break up the large landed estates of the east and his disbanding of the Nazi Storm Troops, or to other unknown reasons, the fact remains that his appointment of Franz von Papen, followed shortly by that of General von Schleicher, set the stage for the advent of Hitler.⁵ Neither of the Cabinets set up by these men could secure majority support in the Reichstag. Meanwhile, Hitler demanded the Chancellorship as leader of the largest party in the Reichstag but, until March, 1933, this request was refused by Hindenburg.

Under von Papen, the Bruening decrees for the protection of public safety were repealed, the ban on the Storm Troops was removed, and on July 20, 1932, the government of Prussia was seized on the grounds of its inability to cope with Communist riots. Von Papen made himself Reich Commissioner for Prussia and Prussian Minister of the Interior in command of the powerful state police.⁶

A civil war ensued between Nazi Brown Shirts and Communists with the government favoring Nazi terrorists in their attempts to exterminate Communists and Jews. Succeeding elections, however, showed continued support of many voters for Communists and Socialists. States of South Germany feared extension of coup d'état tactics to them. In spite of this, however, von Papen's agreement with Hitler in January, 1933, caused the von Schleicher Cabinet to resign and elevated Hitler to power under guarantees imposed upon him by Hindenburg to preserve the Constitution.⁷

Disregarding his pledges, Hitler persuaded Hindenburg to issue decrees suspending civil rights and imposing severe penalties for political crimes. Terrorist tactics were then employed to break up the Communist Party and the labor unions. Parliament was dissolved and new elections called for March 5. Uncertain of their

⁵ A. Brecht, *op. cit.*, pp. 45, 56-60.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 62 ff.

⁷ H. R. Spencer, *Government and Politics Abroad* (New York: Holt, 1936), pp. 381-382.

popular support, in spite of a great campaign of propaganda and suppression of radical groups, Nazi leaders had the Reichstag building burned, accusing Communists of committing the infamous act. In spite of it all, the National Socialists received only about 44 per cent of the popular vote. Combined with their allies, the Hugenberg Nationalists, however, they had about 52 per cent of the popular vote and 340 of the 647 seats in the Reichstag. Unwilling to proceed on this basis, Hitler barred the Communist deputies and had a number of Socialists arrested. Members of other parties were warned to submit or more violent measures would be taken. Under duress, the Reichstag passed the Enabling Act of March 24, 1933.⁸

This act, confirmed by subsequent legislation, conferred unlimited power to legislate by decree upon the Hitler Cabinet. The Reichstag was continued but with only nominal powers. The powers of the President and position of the Reichstag and Reichsrat were guaranteed but treaties were exempted from the Reichstag's jurisdiction. These pledges were not kept. On Hindenburg's death, Hitler merged the offices of President and Chancellor, vesting the powers of both offices in himself. The Reichsrat was later abolished.⁹ From this point on the Weimar Constitution became a dead letter. The Nazis promised a new constitution but never got around to framing one.

Nazi leaders proceeded rapidly to consolidate themselves in power. Public support for the party dictatorship on the part of the masses was mobilized by abolishing or forcing the dissolution of all opposing parties, labor unions, and private associations, such as the Masonic Order, establishing complete control over the press and all forms of expression, making extravagant promises to the people to destroy the "tyranny" of Versailles, overthrow "big industry," redistribute the land, and overcome unemployment. Jews and Communists were selected as scapegoats upon which the people could vent their hatred and sense of frustration. All existing state legislatures and local councils were abolished and Nazi representatives appointed to replace them. Through the removal or attempted removal of all centers of potential opposition, including even the churches, the "totali-

⁸ S. H. Roberts, *The House That Hitler Built* (New York: Harper, 1938), pp. 61-67.

⁹ W. E. Rappard, *Source Book on European Governments* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1937), IV, pp. 14-15.

tarian" state was established. Hitler hoped by this means to perpetuate his control "for a thousand years."¹⁰

The National Socialist Party. The National Socialist Party took its rise at about the same time that General Ludendorff and a group of other high military officers were conspiring to overthrow the Republic. The German Worker's Party organized by Drexler in January, 1919, had a leftist tendency but its orientation was gradually changed by addition to its membership of returned service men, particularly officers who dreamed of Germany's restoration as the great power of Europe. The addition of Hitler as the seventh member of the party committee in July, 1919, greatly stimulated its growth, for Hitler soon displayed his prowess as a public speaker and agitator. Hitler himself was anti-unionist and anti-Marxist from his early youth and after the war displayed a definitely nationalist tendency. His mind, warped by an unfortunate upbringing, was crowded with hatred for Jews and the Churches.¹¹

Failure of the Kapp Putsch in 1920 was followed by Hitler's victory over his rival, Drexler, and his election to the presidency of the party.¹² Hitler's study of the uses of propaganda and methods of campaigning and his skillful management of the party added to its strength. An alliance was made with the Free Corps, renamed the Storm Troops, under Goering and plans were made for another attempt to seize power. This was staged at Munich on November 9, 1923. The Beerhall Putsch taught Hitler that as long as the masses and at least part of the army were willing to support the government, the Republic could not be overturned. He therefore devoted his efforts towards increasing his liaison with the army and the General Staff, whose purposes coincided fundamentally with his own. With army support, he developed new and extraordinary methods of terrorism, under the forms of law, carried on by privately armed groups, and revolutionary propagandist techniques learned from the Bolsheviks and the Allies.¹³

¹⁰ For additional material on this subject see H. Lichtenberger, *The Third Reich* (New York: Greystone, 1937), p. 63 ff., and F. Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 51 ff.

¹¹ Cf. Konrad Heiden, *A History of National Socialism* (New York: Knopf, 1935), Chs. 1, 3; and S. Schultz, *Germany Will Try It Again* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1944), Ch. 4.

¹² Heiden, *loc. cit.*, pp. 52-53.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 37. For material on Hitler's close cooperation with the army, see H. E. Fried, *The Guilt of the German Army* (New York: Macmillan, 1942, pp. 18-22, 27, 28.

Release of Hitler from prison, during which time he had written *Mein Kampf*, found his party disorganized and divided. Hitler, thereupon, proceeded to organize an entirely new party under his leadership, though with many of his old associates. Financed by substantial donations from large-scale industry and aided by army leaders, he organized large contingents of the Brown Shirts and the Elite Guard, the latter a cadre of picked men selected to act as Hitler's bodyguard. With the onset of the depression, large sections of the middle classes, discontented by their economic losses, shifted their votes to Hitler. Added to the votes of the landed interests, war veterans, nationalists, and militarists, this middle class vote was sufficient to make the National Socialists one of the major parties.

Appealing to the German people to revenge the defeat of 1918, the disgrace of the Versailles Treaty, and the spineless inaction of the Weimar Government in the face of large-scale unemployment, Hitler won many young people, students, professional men, and business men to his support.¹⁴

Faced with disconcerting friction between the Brown Shirts and the high command of the regular army and desiring to achieve solidarity in all elements of the new movement, Hitler agreed to purge the party of Brown Shirt leaders and other dissidents. The "blood bath" of June 30, 1934, confirmed the close alliance of army and party and, by its pitiless removal of the principal sources of dissension, promoted harmony in the new regime, leaving Hitler free to regiment the nation in the drive for hegemony of Europe and perhaps of the world.¹⁵

Like one-party systems in Italy and Russia, Nazi leaders endeavored to restrict membership in the party by frequent purges but admission to the party was not as technical a matter as in the case of the Russian Communist Party. The party organization was hierarchical in form with Hitler as *Der Fuehrer* at the head. Attached to his office was a party chancellory which handled all routine business. Subordinate to Hitler was a Deputy Leader, with a staff of four members, who aided *Der Fuehrer* in supervising party affairs. A party Cabinet of nineteen members advised

¹⁴ For additional details on the growth of the Party and the economic factors involved, see H. Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 27 ff.; and R. Heberle, "The Ecology of Political Parties," *American Sociological Review*, IX (August, 1944), pp. 401-414.

¹⁵ That the purge was an intra-family quarrel seems fairly well substantiated. See H. E. Fried, *op. cit.*, pp. 297-299; and F. Neumann, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

the leaders and as heads of various party agencies, administered party business. Territorially, the party was organized on a district, county, and local basis with leaders appointed by Hitler in charge of party affairs. For purposes of party administration, Germany was divided into 32 Gaue or districts. Power gravitated down from the top with officials on lower levels responsible to those above.

Elaborate party headquarters were maintained in Berlin, Munich, and other centers to house the officers, their staffs, and party military formations. Affiliated with the party were associations of professional people, public officials, teachers, and the German Labor Front. Associations for women and students formed part of the regular party hierarchy. Every year an elaborate party Congress was held at Nuremberg.

Relation of the Party to the State. By law, all competing parties were outlawed in July, 1933, and it was made illegal to organize new parties. An act of December 1, 1933, brought about substantial unity of party and state. The party was named as the "bearer" of the German government and indissolubly connected with it. It was said to be the "leading and moving power of the National Socialist State" and its members were given increased duties and privileges in relation to the State. Public officials were required to give assistance to party and Storm Troop officials in the performance of their public duties. The party and its affiliates were declared to be a "corporation of public law" but its members were exempted from ordinary penal law and made subject to special party discipline to be administered by a system of special party courts.¹⁶ Under this law, the party was made independent of the State but above it and in control of it. Der Fuehrer as absolute head of the party (the leader who knows the way) thus would be in control of State affairs even if he had not made himself official head of the State. Party members occupied most of the principal offices and this tendency was intensified after 1938 and during the war.

¹⁶ Cf. J. B. Mason, "The Judicial System of the Nazi Party," *American Political Science Review*, XXXVIII (February, 1944), pp. 96-103; and W. E. Rappard, *op. cit.*, IV, 67-69. The expression "corporation of public law" was obviously a legal fiction which was logically inconsistent and had no relation to the realities since the party insisted upon its own superiority to the State and its power to direct state functions, whereas a corporation is ordinarily viewed as a creature of State law. The purpose here was probably to give legal sanction to the party's extraordinary assumption of legal powers. On this point see also F. Neumann, *op. cit.*, pp. 65-68.

NAZI IDEOLOGY

Nazi apologists had sufficient time before the party came into power to develop a system of rationalization of a fairly convincing nature. Their chief spokesmen, E. R. Huber, F. A. Beck, and A. Rosenberg, drew inspiration from a number of nineteenth century writers including Herder, Hegel, von Humbolt, List, Gobineau, H. S. Chamberlain, Darwin, Marx, and others. The purposes behind this structure of pseudo-scientific dogmas was to build upon principles native to German thinking, justify the expansionist aims of the German nation, provide an efficient political organization of the government, and secure widespread popular support.

The "Folk." The Nazi theory of organic nationalism is biological rather than philosophical in character in that it makes "blood," rather than a spiritual continuity of consciousness (as in Italian Fascism), the connecting principle which fuses men together in a political community. The National Community or the "Folk" is the fundamental organism out of which the State emerges as a mere mechanism for effectuating the aims of the "Folk." The "Folk" is the product of race, soil, and cultural development, has a unified will, and is conscious of its solidarity and purposes. All Germans everywhere are members of this closed community whether citizens of other States or not.

The Principle of Racial Supremacy. Races differ tremendously in intelligence, capacity for civilized life, and creative culture, according to Nazi ideology. They should be graded, Nazi writers contend, according to functions and capacities. The Aryan race has throughout history demonstrated its superiority, as Chamberlain shows, and must be recognized as the master race. Among all Aryans, the Germans are the highest and most worthy. Other races of Aryan origin are to be considered as associates, but non-Aryans belong to inferior stock and should not be allowed to intermarry with Aryans. Racial inferiors within the German racial community must be given by law the degraded status which they deserve. Unworthy races occupying lands needed by the Germans for *Lebensraum* must be subdued by force and subordinated to the needs of the master race. Of all races, the lowest are the Jews. In the Nazi view, they are the principal source of evil in society, of interest and profit slavery, fomentors of Marxian socialism, and of dastardly plots against the unity of the national

community.¹⁷ Nazi theorists used the doctrine of race differences to nullify the Marxian theory of solidarity of the working classes and developed the anti-Jewish theory to turn the edge of working class hatred from the employing class to the Jews. It served also to justify imperialistic expansion into so-called Jewish-dominated States and to rationalize National Socialist attacks upon the Christian Churches whose doctrines are drawn from Jewish sources.¹⁸

The Leadership Principle. The conception of an all-highest leader dove-tailed with German traditions. In the Nazi view, the Leader embodied and gave expression to the basic purposes and aspirations of the "Folk." Since in some metaphysical way, he gave outward expression to the will of the "Folk," his declarations were always authoritative and right and were entitled to implicit obedience. Thus *Vox populi vox dei* was not determined either by parliamentary or popular votes but by the voice of the Leader himself who, being above party and group conflict, spoke from the depths of the Community consciousness.

The Principle of Hierarchy. A graded order of officialdom, descending from an absolute leader through various levels of authority in government and party until the masses of workers or members was reached, is in keeping with German military traditions and appeals to German respect for authority, order, and efficiency. Hence, the hierarchy established in party and state by the Nazis met with ready acceptance from the Army and large numbers of citizens while it facilitated the purpose of National Socialist leaders to solidify their hold on power "for a thousand years" and prepare the nation for war.

The Party Elite. In the National Socialist trinity of people, party, and leader, or supporting class, leading class, and creative class, the party formed the connecting link between the "Folk" and the Fuehrer. Composed of a highly selected group of persons dedicated to their task and owing absolute obedience to the Leader, the party had a two-fold task: to furnish politically creative personalities (the highest leaders) and to preserve the unity of the "Folk." The latter function consisted of promoting in the people an interest in political affairs, inculcating Nazi principles, and securing unanimous support for the aims of the people as declared by Der Fuehrer. In order to secure these objectives, the

¹⁷ F. L. Schuman, "The Political Theory of German Fascism," in W. E. Rappard, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-162.

¹⁸ F. Neumann, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-129.

party was viewed as above and independent of the state yet able to direct it in the prescribed directions.

The State as a Total Unity. In the Nazi view, the ideal of efficiency was best achieved by a political order modelled in its organization along strictly military lines. This required elimination of all elements apt to impose obstacles to the execution of the will of the supreme leader and the subordination of all political, economic, and social categories of life to the basic task of functioning in total unity towards the goals set by the Leader. It was to the achievement of this great aim that Hitler set himself during the nineteen thirties in his "battle" for the national revolution.

The Ends of the State. Fundamentally, the Nazi view was that the State has only one end: the welfare of the "Folk." Included in this, however, are the twin purposes of social and economic well-being through reorganization of resources immediately available and the securing of additional space and resources, *Lebensraum*, in order to maximize well-being. Imperialistic expansion was a necessary implication from Nazi doctrine not only from the doctrine of welfare but as a logical consequence of racial and cultural superiority. Party thinkers set their goals high—the domination of Europe and possibly even of the world.¹⁹

The Party Program. The Nazi bid for popular support required concessions to the felt needs of the people. Hence, the program of the National Socialist Party, first published in 1920, made radical promises to redivide the land among the peasants, break the slavery of interest and profits, guarantee the right to work and earn, socialize the trusts, abolish unearned incomes and war profits, provide for old age security, protect small business, etc. In addition, abolition of the Versailles Treaty, degradation of the Jews, expulsion of aliens, and equality of rights and duties for all citizens were demanded. Very few of these promises were ever carried out. Instead, large-scale business was encouraged, employers were left relatively free while workers were subjected to regimentation, and large landed estates were not broken up.²⁰

¹⁹ For material on this section, see the excellent summary of National Socialist doctrines in R. E. Murphy, et al., *National Socialism* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1943), pp. 3-66.

²⁰ For the full text of the party program, see J. K. Pollock and H. J. Heneman, *The Hitler Decrees* (Ann Arbor: G. Wahr), pp. 1-3; for the economic results, see Otto Nathan, *The Nazi Economic System* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1944), pp. 7-11.

THE GOVERNMENT UNDER NATIONAL SOCIALISM

Constitutional Basis. Hitler took power in accordance with the forms of law. His office and that of his Cabinet was based on presidential decree upon his access to power. Later, the Reichstag voted to amend the Constitution to confer power upon Der Fuehrer and his Cabinet to make law and, after the death of Hindenburg, to consolidate the offices of Chancellor and President of the Reich.²¹ The Enabling Act had the effect, however, of suspending the Weimar Constitution and making it possible for the Cabinet under Hitler's directions to enact both statutory and constitutional law. In effect, the will of the leader became the source of all legal power.

As absolute dictator, all political power was vested in Hitler. In theory, he was sole interpreter of the national political consciousness and, under the doctrine that "the Leader knows the way," the nation owed implicit obedience to his directions. Der Fuehrer was also absolute leader of the Party to whom all of its members had sworn unswerving loyalty. Through his control over the Cabinet he had plenary authority over law-making, and as President and Chancellor, he controlled the vast machinery of the army, the bureaucracy, and local government. Powers over policy-making, appointments and removals, treaties, military affairs, pardons, economic and social activities, and general supervision over all affairs of State were vested in the Leader. During the war, power of life and death over all citizens and the right to seize private property was given him.²²

The Leader's term of office was without definite limit though, as a matter of form, his powers were extended from time to time. His successor was appointed by himself. Leaving details of government to his subordinates except for occasional intervention to adjust mistakes or prevent conflicts, Hitler concentrated on military affairs and foreign policy. His initial diplomatic successes between 1933 and 1939, and his victorious campaigns in 1940-1941, gave him immense popular prestige. Defeats in the latter

²¹ Cf. Pollock and Heneman, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14; and W. C. Langsam, *Documents and Readings in the History of Europe Since 1918* (New York: Lippincott, 1939), pp. 694-695.

²² For an interesting commentary on Der Fuehrer's position, see F. M. Marx, *Government in the Third Reich* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937), pp. 68-76.

stages of the war, however, turned both army and public against him and he gradually lost power to other Nazi leaders.²³

The Leader's Personal Staff. Three Chancelleries were attached to Hitler personally. These were the Chancellery of the Reich, the Chancellery of the President, and the Chancellery of the Leader of the Party. The head of the Reich Chancellery kept the Leader informed of important events occurring throughout the Reich and of legislative proposals formulated in the various Ministries. This office assumed top significance in relation to all legislative matters. The President's Chancellery devoted itself to questions of diplomatic protocol and personnel. The Party Chancellery kept the Leader informed regarding party concerns and operation of economic war policies of the National Defense Council.²⁴

The War Council. In August, 1939, Hitler decreed the establishment of a Ministerial Council for the Defense of the Reich. This body included the Delegate in Charge of the Four-Year Plan (Goering) as chairman, the Commissioners General for Economic Affairs and for Administration, the Chief of the Reich Chancellery, the Leader of the Party Chancellery, and the Chief of the High Command of the Armed Forces. Charged with organizing and conducting the nation's defense, the Council had general powers to coordinate civil, political, military, and economic activities to this end. In order to relieve himself of the huge burden of detail, Hitler conferred plenary executive and legislative authority upon this agency without necessity of counter-signature by the Leader. Power to issue decrees was conferred upon individual members in their spheres of action. Reich Defense Districts headed by Reich Defense Commissioners were established to function as agents of the Council in various parts of the country.

The Cabinet. The coalition Cabinet headed by Hitler in 1933 was gradually transformed through conversions or dismissals into a purely Nazi body. Several new portfolios were added, namely, Propaganda and Public Enlightenment (1933), Air (1933), Church Affairs (1934), and Science and Education (1934). In addition, the Ministry of Economics and Agriculture was divided into two separate departments. In January, 1945, there were fifteen Cabinet Ministries: Interior, Foreign Affairs, Justice, Propaganda,

²³ A. Fredborg, *Behind the Steel Walls* (New York: Viking, 1944), p. 217.

²⁴ W. Ebenstein, *The Nazi State* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1943), pp. 23-25.

Economics, Food and Agriculture, Finances, Labor, Education, Church Affairs, Transport, Post, Armament and War Production, War, Air. In the Cabinet were included, also, the Chief of the Reich Chancellery, the Deputy Leader, the Chief of the High Command of the Armed Forces, the Delegate in Charge of the Four-Year Plan, and other high officials designated by Hitler. The Deputy Leader (Rudolph Hess) was captured and interned in England in 1941 and the Chief of his Cabinet (Bormann) was designated to fulfil the duties of his position. The Chief of the High Command of the Armed Forces was given a Cabinet portfolio in charge of all of the armed forces of the Reich. Thus civilian control over military affairs was removed. The Delegate in Charge of the Four-Year Plan was chairman of the War Cabinet and hence in control of the entire economic system. Orders from Hitler gave him authority to exercise control over all departments of administration the activities of which were of concern to his office.²⁵

In the new regime, the Cabinet lost its position as the central agency of governmental control and became a group of department heads under an all-powerful dictator. Possessing no corporate power as a body, the Cabinet as a policy-making entity largely disappeared. Meetings were held infrequently and Hitler tended to consult members individually. Yet, necessity compelled delegation of large areas of responsibility to Ministers in administering their departments and the abler executives were able to create powerful machines within their jurisdictions. Conflicts and rivalries between them led to oscillations of power which gave precedence to different leaders at different times. Thus, Hermann Goering, Joseph Goebbels, and Joachim von Ribbentrop fought for precedence with Heinrich Himmler, who as head of the Gestapo and the S. S. (Elite Guard), emerged in top place at the end of the war.

Civil Service. Well aware that anti-republican tendencies in the bureaucracy did much to undermine the Weimar Republic, the Party dictatorship took appropriate steps to purge the civil service. By the Act of April 7, 1933, as amended, all government personnel was thoroughly screened. For reasons of inadequate training, Jewish ancestry, affiliation with non-Nazi parties, or female sex, government employees could be dismissed, demoted,

²⁵ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 25 ff.; and K. Loewenstein, "Government and Politics in Germany," *op. cit.*, Ch. XXII.

or barred from employment. Dismissal wages and pensions were granted in all cases except Jews, Communists, and recent appointees. University professors and lower school teachers were also under these restrictions. By the Act of January 26, 1937, previous provisions regarding civil servants were completely overhauled. Under this law, qualifications for office-holding were reduced to five main essentials: (1) special preparation for the position; (2) proven loyalty to the new German State; (3) Aryan parentage; (4) performance of labor and military service; and (5) the oath of allegiance to Hitler.²⁶

In spite of drastic legal provisions, however, the purge was only partly effective even in the higher brackets of service. Due to the need for efficiency, the Party found it necessary to retain highly competent officials and in practice tolerate non-Nazis on all levels but more particularly in the middle and lower strata of government employment. Considerable friction developed between Party and bureaucracy but in the main the bureaucracy was able to maintain a considerable degree of independence.²⁷

The National Legislature. Abolition of the Reichsrat left only the Reichstag as a fragmentary reminder of Republican Germany. Pledged not to eliminate the Reichstag, the Nazis continued it as a shell of its former self. Its deputies continued to be elected but from slates chosen under approval of the Minister of the Interior who was also National Party Manager. No competitive lists were allowed. All but a few were members of the National Socialist Party. Having no business to transact, the Reichstag met infrequently and then only to approve acts of government already accomplished or to highlight some outstanding event. Four elections were held between 1933 and 1938. Deputies continued to draw their salaries though their duties were few. In this way, legislative expression of the popular will was nullified.²⁸

The Judiciary under National Socialism. Legal changes brought about by the Nazis made Hitler the source of law and justice. In the blood purge of 1934, Hitler made himself the supreme judge of the Nation. Appropriate decrees brought the machinery of justice under his direct control. All judges whose dossiers showed a non-Nazi background were purged and their

²⁶ N. Hill and H. Stoke, *op. cit.*, pp. 412-414.

²⁷ Cf. A. Brecht, *op. cit.*, Ch. XIII; and S. Neumann, *Permanent Revolution* (New York: Harpers, 1942), pp. 153-156.

²⁸ For a fuller account, see K. Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 447 ff.

places filled by loyal party supporters. Courts were given warning not to interfere with administrators in their work of enforcing the law. All courts on state and local levels were nationalized and their judges made national officials subject to appointment by Hitler or his deputy, but very few changes were made in the organization of the established court system. District, regional, Superior Regional, and Supreme Courts were allowed to remain but their personnel was required to become Nazis or be removed from office. All vacancies were filled by party members. The administrative courts were maintained but their power to review administrative decrees and try cases of torts against individuals were emasculated. Civil, criminal, and political cases were brought under party influence and the courts were forced to accept party doctrines in regard to them. Only in the realm of private property were the courts able to maintain established rules of law and resist Nazi inroads on recognized principles of justice.²⁹

The criminal code was rewritten to include a wide range of political offenses, punishments were made more severe, and the old theory of punishment for revenge was restored. The dreaded People's Courts were created, in 1936, to enforce the new laws by secret and summary proceedings against political offenders. New forms of punishment for these so-called criminals were meted out in the brutal concentration camps. Special Honor Courts were established to try labor cases under the new labor and professional codes.³⁰ In addition an entire system of party courts, paralleling the regular courts, was erected to deal with cases of breaches of law by party members under a special party code exempting members from ordinary laws.³¹ The substantial effect of these changes was to make "the entire legal system . . . an instrument of the political authorities." Yet, owing to continued assertion of established principles of law, jurisdiction of the "Prerogative State" was not, in practice, unlimited.³² However, the rule of law and independence of the courts was replaced by arbitrary government and a subservient judiciary to a large degree.

Abolition of the Federal System. With astonishing boldness

²⁹ E. Fraenkel, *The Dual State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), pts. 1 and 2.

³⁰ K. Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 487 ff.

³¹ J. B. Mason, *op. cit.*

³² E. Fraenkel, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-58.

and speed, the Nazis engineered the transformation of the Reich from a federal State wherein the member states retained considerable autonomy, to a highly centralized unitary form, thus achieving at one stroke the traditional aspirations of Prussian statesmen and the ambitions of the Prussian military clans. Legislation enacted between 1933 and 1935 transferred all of the powers of the states to the Reich, abolished state legislatures and conferred upon state cabinets power to issue decrees having the force of law, subject to the consent of the National Minister concerned. The office of National Governor was created and one was assigned to each of the states. Appointed and dismissed by Hitler and subject to the Reich Minister of the Interior for the exercise of their powers, these officials bore a faint resemblance to French prefects. In general, they were empowered to supervise execution of National laws in the states, check on the work of the state cabinets, and promulgate laws decreed by the state cabinets.³³

Territories of the original states were preserved intact. State cabinets were appointed by Hitler. Thus all state governmental machinery was brought under immediate national control. In Prussia, Hitler himself performed the duties of National governor, through the agency of the head of the Prussian cabinet. Provincial governors of Prussia were also appointed by Hitler.³⁴

Territorial Expansion of the Third Reich. Acquisition of Austria and the Sudetenland, in 1938, was followed by legislation incorporating them as integral parts of Reich territory. Austria was divided into seven territorial districts each under a National Governor. Many German laws were extended to Austrian territories. The Sudetenland was placed under a National Governor and treated in similar fashion. Danzig was incorporated into the Reich as a free city in 1939. Western Poland and Posen were annexed as provinces of Prussia under provincial governors. Alsace-Lorraine was also reannexed.

Municipal Reorganization. Under the new municipal code promulgated in 1935, all communes were placed under supervision of the Reich Minister of the Interior. Charters could be locally adopted but must be approved by him. All representative councils were abolished and replaced by councils chosen by the agent of the party in cooperation with the Mayor. The Mayors

³³ W. E. Rappard, et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 16-20.

³⁴ K. Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 543-548.

of larger cities were made chief executive officers with full powers. Chosen from among competently trained persons by the Minister of the Interior or the National Governor, depending upon the size of the city, with the advice of the party agent of the locality, the Mayors were aided by executive staffs and the advisory councils. All important municipal activities were supervised by the Minister of the Interior.³⁵

THE NAZI SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRAM

Treatment of the Jews. Hitler's hatred of the Jews was not based merely on his desire to use them as scapegoats to stir up racial, religious, and class antipathies, but seemed to stem from a pathological antipathy developed in early youth.³⁶ In any case, the Jewish question was easily tied in with Nazi racial propaganda and the attack on them found many sympathizers among the German people. Hitler's identification of the Jews with both Communists and capitalists was not very logical, but logic is not of the essence of propaganda.

Preliminary steps against the Jews included their elimination from the civil service, as has already been noted. This was followed by measures to exclude them from the professions. In the lower schools, Jews were segregated and on upper levels their numbers were limited to 1.5 per cent of total student enrollments. Membership was denied them in professional associations. Jews were excluded from positions on "Aryan" newspapers and works of Jewish artists were discriminated against. In the Nuremberg laws of 1935, Jews were defined as persons with three or four Jewish grandparents, or with only two if married to a Jew or professing the Jewish religion. Marriage or sexual intercourse between Jews and Aryans was prohibited under heavy penalties. Persons of mixed parentage were required to marry Aryans. Jews were deprived of citizenship and all political rights, and excluded from military and labor service. Pogroms against the Jews, carried out by Brown Shirt Militia and the Gestapo beginning in 1933, increased in violence until by boycotts, beatings, and finally sequestration and deportation, practically all Jews were eliminated from the life of the community.

³⁵ W. Ebenstein, *op. cit.*, Ch. III.

³⁶ A. Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939), p. 66 ff.

Deprived of their property and excluded from the Labor front, persons of Jewish ancestry were left helpless before the waves of persecution. As a result of the killing by a Polish Jew of a member of the German legation in Paris, a pogrom openly sponsored by the party and its auxiliaries obliterated systematically all remaining vestiges of Jewish property and culture. Thousands were thrown into concentration camps and a capital levy was assessed against the Jews, thus giving the Nazi government much needed revenue without increasing taxes generally.³⁷ Subsequent legislation prohibited Jewish ownership in any type of business, excluded them from public relief and from attendance at Aryan schools. Finally, deportations were begun on a grand scale. By 1943, all but a few thousands of Jews had been removed to the Lublin district of Poland where they were gradually exterminated. Most of those that remained were taken to death camps and there liquidated. Allied intervention in 1945 found only a few thousand Jews remaining in the entire Reich. These are being returned to their homes and rehabilitated.³⁸

Rights and Duties of Citizens. In National Socialist theory not only were races unequal but individuals within the German racial community were unequal. The totality of the nation was all important but this totality must be an ordered one in which individuals are placed according to their status in a hierarchy of superior and inferior with those in subordinate positions yielding unquestioning obedience to orders from above. All organizational and individual centers of obstruction to the ruling class must be removed.³⁹ Seizure of absolute power by the party leadership placed all personal and property rights at their disposal. Duties were emphasized over rights. A tight censorship on outside news was imposed and the government rigidly controlled all information released to the public. Thus public opinion was manipulated towards desired ends.

The Nazi racial creed was applied to citizenship. Under this doctrine blood determined citizenship. Germans abroad were refused the right to divest themselves of German citizenship. Sudeten and Baltic Germans were given citizenship but Jews were deprived of it. Illogically, political exiles were deprived of citi-

³⁷ Graham Hutton, "German Economic Tension: Causes and Results," *Foreign Affairs*, XVII (April, 1939), pp. 521-525.

³⁸ F. Munk, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-63; and *New York Times* (June 10, 1945), press release.

³⁹ F. Neumann, *op. cit.*, pp. 366-367.

zenship. In the occupied territories Poles, Czechs, Russians, etc., were treated as inferior races and subjected to discriminatory treatment.⁴⁰

National Socialism and the Churches. The Christian religion conflicted with Nationalist Socialist dogma at a number of points. Nazis objected principally to the Jewish origin of Christian theology, the doctrines of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God, and teachings of love, humility, and mercy. These concepts ran counter to the Nazi desire to promote racial and national antipathies and glorify war. Rosenberg and others advocated a German religion based on blood and the glorious traditions of Germany's past.⁴¹ Fundamentally, the Nazis wanted to eliminate the Churches as potential centers of opposition and use religion to reenforce their propagandist activities. Many Nazis viewed National Socialism as their religion and aimed at replacing Christ with Hitler and the Bible with *Mein Kampf*.⁴² An organization of "German Christians," backed by the Nazis and aiming at rewriting Christian theology to conform to Nazi theories, gained control of Church Synods. Their heretical doctrines led to a split in the Lutheran Church, particularly over the Jewish question. Orthodox pastors organized the "Confessional Synod of the German Evangelical Church" and resisted Nazi attempts to unify the Churches in spite of persecution. In 1935, a National Department for Church Affairs was created with legal control over both Protestant and Catholic Churches. Lutheran youth groups were fused with Hitler youth and, except for the radical pastors, most Lutherans submitted to Hitler's government.

The Concordat of 1933 made by the Catholic Church with the Nazi regime to safeguard its rights was flouted by Nazi leaders. Accused of being a foreign political movement, youth groups of the Church were forced into Hitler Youth, the clergy persecuted, and many churches and religious orders forced to close. The Catholic clergy refused to submit to State control and protested vigorously against sterilization, suppression of Catholic newspapers, schools, youth groups, and religious orders. The Pope

⁴⁰ F. Munk, *op. cit.*, Ch. III; N. Hill and H. Stoke, *op. cit.*, pp. 409-412; and R. E. Murphy, et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 67-92.

⁴¹ Cf. R. L. Buell, *op. cit.*, pp. 291-295; and N. Micklem, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), pp. 9-23.

⁴² N. Micklem, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-30.

denounced the trend to heathenism in Germany.⁴³ In spite of all resistance, however, the Nazis succeeded in gaining control over the bulk of German youth and indoctrinating them in the worship of strength and brutality. Led by men like Karl Barth and Pastor Martin Niemöller, Protestant Churches cooperated with Catholics in upholding Christian ideals and serving congregations. Catholic funds kept the struggle going. This resistance to Nazi policies made the churches of Germany an important center of influence after the war.⁴⁴

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Agriculture. The Nazi plan was to render Germany self-supporting in agriculture so as to defeat the effects of a blockade in time of war. Under the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture, Walter Darré, a number of steps were taken to accomplish this. Food prices were fixed on the market so as to increase the farmer's return, loans were made easier, and rationing was instituted, in 1935, to conserve foodstuffs. In order to relieve small farmers of the heavy burden of debt and prevent further division of the land into small parcels, the hereditary farm act of 1933 was passed. This provided that all farms of under 300 acres were to be hereditary homesteads. The owners could not sell or mortgage them without State permission, nor could they be attached by creditors. The rule of primogeniture was applied in inheriting the properties. To secure coordination and planning of the effort for food and production, an Agriculture Estate was formed which included all farmers. Subject to the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, a Reich Peasant's Leader was established with a large staff and an advisory Farmer's Council. Subordinate leaders and councils were set up on provincial and local levels. All food-producing or -processing enterprises were included, usually in associations organized according to the type of production involved.

The great expectations aroused by this ambitious project were not justified by results. Though committed to a program of redistributing the land, Hitler was too anxious to win over army commanders to antagonize them by breaking up the great Junker

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 53 ff.

⁴⁴ A. Fredborg, *op. cit.*, pp. 238, 249-251.

estates of Prussia from which they, in large part, came. Hence, the reforms affected only about half of the farming area. Food production was not increased, partly, perhaps, because of the great shift of farm workers to industrial centers. Meanwhile, the benefits of the increase in prices of foodstuffs was offset by regimentation of the farmers.⁴⁵

The Estate of Industry and Trade. In the field of industry the major purpose of the National Socialists was to organize the nation for war while preserving as far as possible the rights and interests of large property owners, the military clique, and the upper classes generally. These aims were served by abolishing independent labor unions and subjecting labor to regimentation by employers and the government, and imposing general governmental controls over business organizations while private ownership rights were left intact. The Nazis prided themselves upon this retention of private business as a feature which distinguished the National Socialist regime from Bolshevist Socialism and indicated their high esteem for private enterprise. Actually this situation was only temporary because, as the economy approached maximum production, government regulation of private enterprise became more and more detailed while government corporations, or government-sponsored cartels, took over larger and larger areas of business. Some writers alleged that there was little difference between National Socialism at this stage and Bolshevist Socialism in Russia.⁴⁶

Business associations on local, regional, and national levels were nationalized, and their officers placed under control of the Minister of Economics. These were integrated into larger bodies called National Groups. All business men were forced to belong to these associations and many of the old officers were retained in the new organizations. Supervision over all businesses within their category of production was exercised on various levels by these bodies. Capping all such business and trade organizations was a Reich Economic Chamber in which representatives of all Chambers and associations were included. The Reich Department of Economics exercised general supervision over the entire

⁴⁵ Cf. S. H. Roberts, *op. cit.*, Ch. 6; F. H. Marx, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-165; and A. Gerschenkron, *Bread and Democracy in Germany* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1943), p. 154 ff.

⁴⁶ See "The Destruction of Capitalism in Germany," *Foreign Affairs*, XV (July, 1937), pp. 595-607.

framework through the Reich Chamber of Industry and its regional branches. The Nazi government used this structure to direct, control, aid, and indoctrinate business men and their groups so as to fit them in with Nazi purposes. Handicraft guilds were organized in similar fashion to integrate small hand trades under national direction.⁴⁷

In 1938, when maximum production was reached but more munitions of war were demanded, the Hitler government instituted the Four-Year Plan, headed by Reichsmarshal Goering. Equipped with supreme powers over all department heads and party leaders, this agency controlled production; allocation, exchange, and prices of raw materials; manpower, agricultural commodities; foreign exchange; etc. Detailed plans were administered by the Department of Economics which gradually took over many of the functions of the planning organization. Special agencies expedited production of particular commodities, such as coal, steel, oil, etc.

With the outbreak of war, a Ministerial Council for Defense of the Reich was organized with Goering as chairman. Composed of key department heads and party men, this body became a super-cabinet for the prosecution of the war. A General Council, composed of under-secretaries and headed by Goering, coordinated war efforts on lower levels. Reich Commissioners on national and regional levels speeded up industrial production.⁴⁸ As the war progressed, dearth of capable bureaucrats caused the expanded controls of government over business to break down and business men were permitted to regain power. Concentration of production in a few huge cartels which spread their tentacles over Europe was encouraged by the government.⁴⁹

The Labor Front. Independent labor unions were dissolved and a Labor Front organized in 1933. Nazi policy excluded labor from representation in the new estate of Industry and Trade. The Labor Front was supposed to include both workers and employers under direction of the State. Dr. Robert Ley, its head, and all of its leaders were party members. Membership of workers was voluntary but those not belonging were discriminated against. Basic units were the workers and employers of a single

⁴⁷ For further details on this section see Otto Nathan, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-41.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 43-57.

⁴⁹ Paul Wohl, "New Directors for German Industry," *Commonweal*, XXXVI (July 3, 1942), pp. 248-251.

firm. These were combined into some 15,000 local groups. District, regional, and national machinery articulated all units into a close-knit organization under party auspices. Labor Front functions included reconciliation of differences between employers and employees and provision of education, social insurance, and recreational facilities for its members. No collective bargaining by this agency was permitted.

In 1934, an Act to Regulate National Labor outlawed strikes and lockouts and made the employer of each business the Leader of the enterprise with power to determine hours, wages, and conditions of work subject to advice of a plant council elected by the employees from a list drawn up by the Leader and the head of the plant party cell. Labor Trustees were set up in 14 districts. They were given power to establish general principles for collective agreements, approve large-scale dismissals, and establish new wage schedules in an emergency.⁵⁰ Industrial Courts of Honor were established in connection with the Labor Trustees to act upon appeals by workers or employees from violations of the rules. In 1939, powers of the Labor Trustees were broadened to cover collective agreements and maximum wages so that National officials practically controlled conditions of work without Labor having any voice in them. Labor Exchanges were given a monopoly over the labor supply. Every worker was required to carry an Employment Book showing his status as a worker.⁵¹

Labor Service. Four types of compulsory labor service were instituted in the Third Reich. All boys and girls from 18 to 25 were liable for six months' service in labor camps at tasks useful to the community. Besides contributing valuable work, the camps served as preparation for military service later on. All persons were made liable for emergency service in case of national disaster. In 1938, general labor conscription was introduced and later applied to any resident who might be drafted for indefinite periods and sent anywhere. In January, 1943, all unemployed men of 16 to 63 and women of 17 to 45 were required to register for defense work. Women, after 1938, could be conscripted for work on farms. Workers were forbidden to leave their jobs without permission. Child labor laws were suspended and children of school-leaving age were required to register for work or train-

⁵⁰ C. W. Guillebaud, *The Social Policy of Nazi Germany* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1941), Ch. II.

⁵¹ Otto Nathan, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-196.

ing.⁵² Opinions differ as to the effects of Nazi labor policy upon the workers prior to the war. Guillebaud contends that in spite of abolition of the unions and persecution by the Gestapo, the high wages and good working conditions up to 1939 left the workers satisfied. Others stress the fact that the worker's condition was nothing less than wage slavery.⁵³ After 1939, all standards were lowered and the lot of the workers became progressively worse.

ARMED FORCES OF THE THIRD REICH

The Army. In cooperation with the German General Staff, Hitler built up the army from the 100,000 men prescribed by the Treaty of Versailles to 800,000 by 1939. Wartime mobilization increased it to over 7,000,000 men organized into over 300 combat divisions. For purposes of army administration, Germany was divided into fifteen army corps districts. During the war four more were added in Poland and Czechoslovakia. Conscription under the Nazis involved six months' labor service followed by two years' military service for all able-bodied men beginning at the age of twenty. As the demands of war increased all eligible men were taken between the ages of 16 and 60. Poles, Czechs, Russians, and other foreigners were drafted into the armed services.

Auxiliary Forces. Included in the auxiliary forces were the special party troops, the Elite Guards, who were later incorporated into the regular army forces. They numbered approximately twenty divisions. The S.A., or Storm Troopers, initially important in the party's rise to power, declined in numbers but were still in existence during the war. In 1944, the desperate exigencies of the war resulted in organization of a People's Army (Volkssturm), which was to include every able-bodied man, boy, and even women if necessary, not serving in the regular armed forces. This body, poorly trained and equipped and used to man garrisons and fixed fortifications, was relatively ineffective.

The Navy. Handicapped by the forced scuttling of World War I naval forces and limited economic resources, Germany was un-

⁵² C. W. Guillebaud, *op. cit.*, Ch. III.

⁵³ Cf. *Ibid.*, Ch. VIII; and L. Hamburger, *How Nazi Germany Has Mobilized and Controlled Labor* (Washington: Brookings, 1940), p. 50 ff.

able to construct a large fleet. What navy she had was kept bottled up to a large degree by Allied air and naval power. Hence, the Nazis relied principally upon submarines which early in the war were very destructive to Allied merchant shipping.

The Air Force. Considered invincible at the beginning of the war and almost unlimited in numbers, the air force, built up under Goering's leadership, actually consisted of about three thousand first-line aircraft. Opposed by rising Allied air power, the Luftwaffe rapidly declined in effectiveness.

NAZI FOREIGN POLICIES

Nazi leaders employed clever and successful maneuvers in their efforts to achieve a free hand in the domination of Europe. In the main, their strategy consisted in (1) removing the hampering restrictions of the Versailles Treaty as regards reparations and rearmament; (2) using of effective propaganda in hostile countries of Europe to arouse discontent among dissident elements and promote confusion of policy and defeatism; (3) rearming the nation as rapidly as possible; (4) removing all sources of disunity within the Reich; (5) reorganizing and expanding economic production to a maximum; (6) breaking up all hostile alliances, particularly the French continental system embodied in the past with the Little Entente, Poland, and the U.S.S.R.; (7) promoting friendliness with Great Britain so as to immobilize France while lost territories such as the Saar Valley were recovered and the neutralized Rhineland was invaded and refortified; (8) building a system of alliances to counterbalance the weakened allied coalition (The Triple Axis—Germany, Italy, and Japan—comprised the three principal have-not nations); (9) attacking each link in the steel chain encircling Germany one at a time, beginning with the small powers, while keeping the larger ones off balance by threats and promises; (10) continuing the policy of "divide and conquer" a step at a time at first, then speeding up as the forces of opposition were gradually removed and the way became less obstructed.

The detailed story of Hitler's moves cannot be told here. Suffice it to say that Hitler's first step was to withdraw from the League of Nations and announce Germany's intention immediately to rearm. This was followed by Germany's refusal to pay

any more reparations. The Saar Valley was reannexed as a result of a plebiscite. Fears of Germany's principal rivals were quieted by a ten-year non-aggression pact with Poland and a naval limitation treaty with Great Britain. Support was given to Mussolini's Italy in her struggle against League sanctions in the war with Ethiopia and as a result the Rome-Berlin Axis was formed in October, 1936. The two powers then cooperated in supporting Spanish fascists in the Spanish Civil War. By 1937, Japan was added to the Axis alliance. In 1936, Hitler invaded the Rhineland and refortified it while Great Britain and France failed to act. In 1938, Austria was absorbed and the Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia taken over. The Munich Accord of 1938 marked British and French acquiescence in Germany's preliminary expansionist moves. It was followed quickly by seizure of the remainder of Czechoslovakia and German invasion of Hungary and Rumania. Consummating a military alliance with Italy in May, 1939, Hitler then cleverly negotiated a non-aggression pact with Russia in August whereby Russia agreed, in exchange for eastern Poland and a free hand in Finland and the Baltic States, not to attack Germany in event of war. Having seemingly eliminated the possibility of a two-front war against Germany, Hitler then demanded return of the Polish Corridor in defiance of British-French guarantees to Poland, thus precipitating World War II.⁵⁴

GERMANY IN THE WAR

Defeat of Poland and occupation of foreign territory in Europe between 1938 and 1941 vastly increased Germany's war potential. Ample supplies of steel and coal were obtained but cotton, jute, rubber, nickel, tin, and petroleum were badly needed and hard to obtain.⁵⁵ The victory over France, in 1940, put large supplies of foodstuffs and manpower in Nazi hands and for a time Germany seemed to have the world at her feet. Stopped in her plans by Britain's decision to resist, and defeated in the air by British air fleets, Hitler decided against invasion of England, fearing an

⁵⁴ For an excellent treatment of this period in Europe see F. L. Schuman, *Europe on the Eve* (New York: Knopf, 1939); and *Night Over Europe* (New York: Knopf, 1941).

⁵⁵ Louis Domercatzky, "The Industrial Power of the Nazis," *Foreign Affairs*, XIX (April, 1941), pp. 641-654.

attack on his rear by the Red Army.⁵⁶ Confident in the ability of the Wehrmacht to defeat the armies of the U.S.S.R., Der Fuehrer made his fateful decision to attack Russia in June, 1941. In December he declared war on the United States. The war with the eastern colossus placed a tremendous strain on the Reich. Losses of manpower on the battlefield, the scorched earth policy of the Russians, and failure of the occupied territories to deliver expected supplies, soon used up the surpluses. War wastage required application of more and more labor and machines in production for military purposes. Capital equipment and consumer goods were neglected. Minimum hours of labor became from 10 to 14 a day. Foreign slave labor was imported in larger and larger numbers. Rations were severely cut and black markets flourished. The blockade and necessities of war placed a greater load on railways and truck transportation which proved unable to handle the increased traffic adequately.⁵⁷

The defeat at Stalingrad blocked Germany from access to ample supplies of oil in the Caucasus while the Allied invasion of North Africa cut her off from supplies coming from that area. The waning fortunes of the Nazi regime and the advance of the Red armies aroused fears of Germany's middle and upper classes that Hitler might go Communist or that he might pull them down in the defeat of the regime.⁵⁸

Tremendous German losses on the Eastern Front compelled the Reich government to resort to desperate devices to obtain manpower to replace them and especially to cope with huge American war production now reaching a peak. Besides invoking total conscription of all German labor, the Nazis introduced compulsory conscription in all of the occupied territories. Millions of men and women were forced to enter the Reich as slave-laborers.⁵⁹ Early in 1943, Hitler withdrew as active commander of German armies and recalled Old Guard Prussian staff officers to take his place. With the army aristocracy back in power, party

⁵⁶ J. Lorraine, *Behind the Battle of France* (London: Oxford University Press, 1943), p. 3.

⁵⁷ S. B. Fay, "The Cost of German Victory," *Current History*, III (October, 1942), pp. 119-126.

⁵⁸ Cf. C. Thompson and C. E. Black, "The European Scene—Germany," *Current History*, III (February, 1943), p. 505; "Undercurrents in Germany," *op. cit.*, III (March, 1943), pp. 46-50; and Walter Mehring, "Test of the Scapegoats," *Nation*, CLIX (July 29, 1944), pp. 128-129.

⁵⁹ "Undercurrents in Germany," *loc. cit.*

troops, especially the Elite Guard, were temporarily eclipsed.⁶⁰

The surrender of Italy enabled the western Allies to bomb production and oil centers in the Balkans and south Germany. Bombings of north German industrial centers expanded enormously with resulting disastrous effects upon German morale and productive capacity. Hitler's fears of civil war or a coup d'état by the army elite increased. Heinrich Himmler, Chief of the Gestapo and the Elite Guard, was made Minister of the Interior with control over all police forces and local officials.⁶¹

By the spring of 1944, it was apparent to all that Germany's defeat was certain. Friction between the Army and the Nazi Party increased. Elite Guard regiments were distributed among Army divisions to check on their loyalty. Officers with party backgrounds were given high posts of command. Finally in July, 1944, conspirators of the Army High Command staged a bomb attack on Hitler and attempted to take over the government. The plot was thwarted by alert party men, the ringleaders killed, and a drastic reorganization of the regime was brought about by decree. Goering was made supreme commander of industry, manpower, and communications, with Goebbels as his deputy. Himmler was placed in command of all Home forces, theoretically subordinate to Goering but actually superior to him through his control over the police, military forces, and local officials in his capacity as Minister of the Interior. The purge of army officers and party men seriously weakened the government.

Germany in Defeat. On June 6, 1944, Allied armies invaded Normandy and within two months had driven the German forces to France's eastern frontiers. The fall and winter months were devoted to breaking through Germany's Rhine system of fortification while the Red Army invaded the Reich from the east. An Allied breakthrough in the west permitted a junction with the Red Army near the Elbe River late in April. Hitler committed suicide after directing a futile defense of Berlin. After repeated attempts on the part of Himmler to surrender to the western Allies, German commanders capitulated to General Eisenhower on May 7, and to Red Army General Zhukoff in Berlin on May 8.

⁶⁰ Carol Thompson, "Hitler's New Crop of Woes," *Current History*, IV (April, 1943), pp. 128-132.

⁶¹ S. B. Fay, "Sombre Shadows Over Hitler's Reich," *Current History*, V (October, 1943), pp. 139-146; and Carol Thompson, "Ersatz German Revolutions?" *Current History*, V (December, 1943), pp. 327-334.

THE ALLIED OCCUPATION AND GOVERNMENT OF GERMANY

The Allied Control Council (ACC). Under agreements reached at Yalta in December, 1944, and confirmed by the Berlin Declaration of August 3, 1945, Germany was divided into three major zones. A smaller zone, carved out of territory allocated to the British and Americans, was given to France. An Allied Control Council was set up consisting of the commanders-in-chief of the occupation forces of the four powers. Each had supreme authority in his own zone of occupation, and joint authority over affairs of Germany as a whole. The zone locations and areas were plotted by the European Advisory Council and the precise boundaries agreed upon by the ACC. The eastern half of Germany was allotted to the U.S.S.R., Northwestern Germany was given to Great Britain, southwestern Germany to the United States, and a western zone along the French boundary to France.

Under provisions of the Potsdam Declaration, the Control Council was made responsible for enforcement of the political principles agreed upon by the Allies as the basis of their policy towards Germany. In summary, these provided for (1) the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany including (a) abolition of all military organizations and their auxiliaries, (b) destruction of or control over all weapons and munitions of war and the instruments for their production, including industrial facilities; (2) measures to convince the German people of their total defeat and war guilt; (3) destruction of the National Socialist Party and its auxiliaries and eradication of Nazi activities and propaganda; and (4) preparation of Germany to become a democracy living on peaceful terms with the rest of the world. The means indicated for achieving this included (a) abolition of all Nazi discriminatory legislation, (b) punishment of war criminals and arrest and internment of Nazi leaders and sympathizers, (c) removal of all Nazi Party members from responsible public and private positions, (d) elimination of all Nazi and militarist conceptions from German education and inculcation of democratic ideas, (e) creation of a dependable judiciary capable of enforcing justice and equality before the law, (f) decentralization of the government and development of local responsibility.

In order to secure this last objective, the Control Council was ordered to (1) restore local self-government throughout Germany on democratic principles, resorting particularly to elective councils; (2) encourage democratic political parties with freedom of assemblage and discussion; (3) introduce representative and elective principles in regional, provincial, and Länd administration as rapidly as possible; (4) prevent organization of a central German government for the time being but establish a limited number of administrative departments including finance, transport, communications, foreign trade, and industry, these departments to function under the ACC; and (5) permit freedom of speech, press, and religion, subject to the maintenance of military security.

The Council was also charged with enforcement of certain economic principles. These, in summary, included (1) prevention of production of all arms and munitions of war, machinery, ships, airplanes, metals, and chemicals useful for war purposes; (2) removal of unneeded productive capacity to help pay for reparations; (3) organization of the German economy on the basis of agriculture, and peaceful domestic industries. In the exercise of these responsibilities, certain principles of procedure were laid down: (1) uniformity of treatment of the people of Germany as a whole should be practiced as far as possible; (2) Germany should be treated as an economic unit, and common economic policies should be followed; (3) Allied controls should be employed only to the extent necessary to secure compliance with Allied policies and secure adequate production of goods and services; (4) German administrative machinery should be employed as far as possible to apply the economic provisions in detail so that responsibility for any breakdowns would rest upon the German people themselves.

The Council was also instructed to undertake immediate measures to (1) repair public utilities, transport, and housing facilities, and (2) expand coal and agricultural production. It was authorized further to take control over all German-owned external assets and provide means for payment of essential imports into Germany.

Organization of the ACC. By provisions of the "Statement on the Control of Occupied Germany" issued by the ACC early in June, 1945, the Council decided to appoint a political advisor to aid it in its deliberations. All acts of the Council pertaining to

Germany as a whole required a unanimous vote of all four members. To expedite Council action, a permanent coordinating committee was created composed of one representative of each of the zone commanders. A Control Staff was set up for purposes of administration consisting of the following divisions: Military, Naval, Air, Political, Economic, Finance, Reparations, Deliveries and Restitution, Internal Affairs and Communications, Legal, Prisoners of War and Displaced Persons, and Manpower. A commission of four (one from each government) headed each division. The functions of the Coordinating Committee and the Control Staff were to advise the Council, and to exercise general supervision over execution of the Council's decisions, particularly with respect to their administration in detail by German agencies. Military commissions from other United Nations could be attached to the Council to act as liaison officers.

The Government of Greater Berlin. Under previous agreements, all four powers were to participate in the government of metropolitan Berlin. Since the city had been occupied for some time by troops of the Red Army, considerable delay resulted due to discussions over delimitation of zones and provisions for feeding of the people, before troops of the other Allied powers were allowed to move in. By vote of the ACC, the area of Greater Berlin was divided into four zones, one to be allocated to each of the four powers and to be occupied by the troops of that power. An inter-Allied governing authority (the Kommandatur) was created to exercise general supervision over the metropolitan area. It consisted of four commandants, each designated by his appropriate zone commander, and each serving in rotation as chief commandant or chairman of the Kommandatur. This body, aided by a technical staff, determined policies and exercised general supervision over the Berlin area on behalf of the ACC and the four occupying powers. Its orders, however, were imposed upon the people through the agency of a chief burgomaster and a German staff of burgomasters and other functionaries. Agreement having been reached respecting zone boundaries and other matters at issue, troops of the western powers, in July, moved into their respective zones in Berlin.⁶²

Government in the American Zone. Since space will not permit

⁶² The "Statement" of the ACC is printed in the *New York Times* for May 28 and June 3, 1945. The "Berlin Declaration" was released by all newspapers on August 3, 1945.

detailed consideration of governmental arrangements in all of the zones, those of the American zone will be taken as an example. General Dwight D. Eisenhower became the zone commander and commander-in-chief of all United States forces in Germany. Lieutenant General Lucius Clay is the Deputy Military Governor. A zone Control Council was set up to coordinate the work with the Allied Control Council. The zone Council was organized in twelve major divisions roughly corresponding to the Ministries of the former Third Reich. The army, navy, and air divisions dealt with demobilization of Germany's armed forces and the disarmament of Germany. The Transport division supervised all transport facilitation. The political division handled all foreign affairs and domestic political matters, protected American interests in Germany, and advised the other divisions on political aspects. The Economic, Finance, and Reparations, Deliveries and Restitution divisions are explained by their names. The Internal Affairs and Communications division supervised public safety, health, and welfare, public utilities and local government. The Legal division supervised the courts and prosecuted war crimes. The Prisoners of War and Displaced Persons division is self explanatory. The Manpower division handled labor relations and policies, housing and job allocations. It supervised dissolution of the Labor Front and reorganization of free labor unions. Heads of divisions together constituted the Control Council and individually functioned as departmental administrators. All divisions cooperated in the purge of Nazis from government and industry, each taking responsibility for his own field. An Intelligence section exercised general supervision over the purge and dissolution of underground activities. A section on Public Information controlled all forms of public expression in Germany and actions to dissolve all agencies of the Reich's Propaganda Ministry. A Public Relations section handled problems of the world press, including censorship.⁶³

Territorial and Population Settlements. Subject to a final peace treaty, the three Allied chiefs of state at the Potsdam Conference, July 17-August 2, 1945, agreed to cede to the U.S.S.R. the City of Königsberg in East Prussia and territory adjacent to it, connecting with Lithuania, for a warm water port. To compensate Poland for loss of territory in the east to Russia, the Con-

⁶³ "American Organizational Plans for the Military Government of Germany," *Department of State Bulletin*, XII (May 13, 1945), pp. 900-902.

ference provisionally allocated to her a large section of eastern Germany running from west of Swinemunde on the Baltic Sea along the Oder River to its confluence with the Western Neise River and along that river to the Czechoslovak frontier. Thus, all of East Prussia, eastern Pomerania, parts of Brandenburg, and all of Silesia, one of Germany's most highly developed industrial areas, was lost to Germany. Agreements regarding Germany's western frontiers were left to the final peace settlement for which the Council of Foreign Ministers, created by the Conference, was instructed to make preparations. On August 8, the decision of the victorious powers to separate Austria completely from the Reich was announced. Pending its final restoration as an independent state, a four-power Control Council for Austria was established with powers and purposes similar to that of Germany.

In an attempt to eliminate the problem of German minorities in countries immediately adjacent to the Reich and to prevent German attempts to regain lost territory by using the excuse of oppressed German minorities, the Conference ordered the repatriation of German populations from Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Power to control the transfer and distribute the repatriates equitably among the four zones was vested in the ACC.⁶⁴

Effects of the Potsdam Declaration upon Germany. As a consequence of the Potsdam decision, Germany has lost completely her previous status as one of the great industrial powers of the world. Stripped of one-fourth of her territory, she was faced with further losses at the peace conference due to demands of France regarding the Saar Valley and the Rhineland, and claims of the Netherlands for German land to compensate for areas flooded by the German armies. Moreover she was compelled to accommodate additional millions of repatriated Germans in an area largely denuded of its heavy industrial equipment. The lot of the former "master race" was destined to be hard. The declared policy of the Allied powers to reduce Germany to the status of a peaceful agrarian state with a standard of living no higher than that of the rest of Europe was given lip-service at Potsdam and an attempt was made in the earlier days of the occupation to carry it out. However, the break-up of the coali-

⁶⁴ See the Berlin Declaration and "Four Power Rule Set Up for Austria," press release, August 8, 1945.

tion of the western powers with the U.S.S.R. and fear of the former of a possible attempt on the part of the Soviets to expand across Germany into western Europe has resulted in a reversal of policy. Beginning in the spring of 1946, Great Britain and the United States encouraged German industrial expansion with a view not only to cutting allied occupation costs by enabling the Germans to pay for their imports with manufactured goods but to strengthen Germany as a buffer against further Russian expansion westward.

APPLICATION OF ALLIED POLICIES IN GERMANY

Reparations. Contrary to the reparations agreements of World War I, no fixed amounts in money were set for Germany to pay. It was agreed among the Allies that in so far as she was able, Germany should be compelled to restore or replace all stolen or destroyed property and make compensation for damage and destruction committed in territories occupied by the Wehrmacht. To this end, the Allies agreed to retain control over such war prisoners as were needed and utilize their labor to repair and restore all damaged or destroyed properties and facilities. In the case of Great Britain and the United States, war prisoners were used mainly for reconstruction in Germany itself, but because of the tremendous damage wrought by the Wehrmacht in occupied Russia, the U.S.S.R. compelled several millions of Germans to work, under conditions of forced labor, in territory of the U.S.S.R. The French government secured the services of about 700,000 German war prisoners for reconstruction work in that country.

To permit replacement of destroyed production goods, particularly in Russia and Poland, the U.S.S.R. was granted the right by the Potsdam Conference not only to take all "surplus" machinery from the Russian Zone but 25 per cent of all such goods were conceded to her from the zones of the other powers. Ten per cent of this was to be straight reparations and 15 per cent was to be turned over to the Russians in exchange for foodstuffs and raw materials from the eastern zone. A Reparations Commission created by the Conference was instructed to determine within a period of six months the total amounts to be

taken from the western zones. In addition, the German Navy and Merchant Marine were to be divided among the Allies according to a plan to be worked out by a commission, set up separately for this purpose. In exchange for the benefits received by the U.S.S.R. in these arrangements, the Kremlin waived all claims to the German gold captured by the western Allies. In practice this agreement had broken down by the spring of 1946 due to inability of the four governments to agree as to how far German industry should be eliminated and how much in the way of foodstuffs and raw materials should be shipped from eastern Germany in compensation. For this reason, American military authorities stopped shipment of machinery into the eastern zone.⁶⁵

Punishment of War Criminals. Under the agreements made at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, in October, 1943, offenders against the laws of nations, laws of war, and laws of particular states were to be returned to those states and subjected to trial and punishment by them if their crimes were of a local character. If not, they were to be tried by an Inter-Allied Tribunal to be established by agreement. Under the first provision, common war criminals were sent to the places of their crimes and prosecuted. In the American zone, the A.M.G. was daily holding trials and carrying out executions. In the meantime, a series of meetings of representatives of the four Allied governments were held in London to work out arrangements for the trial of war criminals whose crimes had no particular geographical localization. An Allied tribunal consisting of judicial representatives of Russia, Great Britain, the United States, and France was set up at Nuremberg and conducted a trial lasting for many months. After exhaustive examination of evidence, extended taking of testimony and offering of arguments, the Court brought in a decision on October 1, 1946, condemning 12 of the highest surviving leaders of the Nazi regime to death by hanging, three to life imprisonment, and four to prison terms ranging from 10 to 20 years. Three were acquitted.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ See the Berlin Declaration, *op. cit.*, and the articles on Germany in the *United States News* for August 10, 1945; April 12, and May 10, 1946.

⁶⁶ For additional material on this subject, see Quincy Wright, "War Criminals" *American Journal of International Law*, XXXIX (April, 1945), pp. 257-285; and Report of Robert H. Jackson to the President on "Atrocities and War Crimes," *Department of State Bulletin*, XII (June 10, 1945), pp. 1071-1078, and Press Releases, October 16 and 17, 1946.

The Purge. In September, 1944, General Eisenhower issued a directive requiring the destruction of National Socialism and the removal of all Nazis and members of the S.S. from all responsible positions. This was followed by regulations of the Allied Military Government providing for the immediate dissolution of all National Socialist organizations and the abolition of all laws of the Reich involving racial, religious, or political discrimination, or placing the Party in a position of special privilege. Officers of Nazi Party organizations were required to remain at their posts under penalty of death until all funds, property, records, equipment, etc. were turned over to Allied authorities. In compliance with these orders, American authorities have attempted the enormous task of rooting out all Nazis or Nazi sympathizers from positions of power and influence in government and industry. Even the courts and the schools were closed temporarily in order to remove Nazi personnel. Screening of the entire population in certain sections was followed by huge raids covering the entire American zone in which thousands of persons were arrested for various violations of regulations.

In addition, American representatives of the ACC recommended to that body the splitting up of all German officer personnel on the higher levels and exiling them to different parts of the world in order to destroy once and for all the German High Command. As time went on, the initial zeal of Allied authorities waned. The need for cooperation from the Germans, fraternization with friendly Germans, and a growing desire to cultivate friendship with the Germans as an offset to Russian ambitions tended to militate against the purge. Nevertheless, frequent raids by Allied secret police revealed the presence of Nazi underground opposition.⁸⁷

Allied Plans for Germany. By decision of the Potsdam Conference, no central government was provided for Germany although several departments of administration considered necessary for effective carrying on of the government were established. In the "Potsdam Declaration" and the "Statement" of the ACC any intention to annex Germany or destroy her as a nation was expressly denied. Allied leaders, also, decided against demands from many sides that Germany should be permanently parti-

⁸⁷ *New York Times*, July 22 and 24, 1945, "Eisenhower's Orders on Germany," *Current History*, N.S. VII (November, 1944), pp. 412-415.

tioned or decentralized into autonomous regions in order to eliminate the threat of a war of revenge by a strong central government in the Reich. Nevertheless, under the plans placed in effect, a number of years were expected to elapse before a national German government could be allowed to organize and operate independently.

Democracy for Germany? American plans to encourage democracy in Germany took the form of reconstituting local self-government in the hands of trustworthy Germans and through experiments in smaller areas gradually extending popular self-government to larger and larger groupings. First, local and provincial governments manned with German personnel were set up. Then these were followed by the establishment of a German government for the American Zone. Plans were made to merge the American and British Zones under a common government in the summer of 1946 but a proposal to bring all four sectors together under a central German government was defeated, owing to French and Russian opposition.

Local and county elections held in the spring and summer of 1946 revealed a strong anti-communist trend in non-Soviet-occupied German territory. Soviet attempts to organize a "Unity Party" from the fusion of Social Democrats and Communists succeeded in the Soviet Zone but failed elsewhere. Only in Soviet-occupied territory did the Communists win control and then only through aid of the Soviet authorities. In the Berlin local elections, held October 20, 1946, Communists were badly defeated even in the Soviet Zone, the vote against them being nearly three to two. In the other zones, the anti-Communist vote was overwhelming. In these elections the Social Democrats, Christian Democrats (Catholic), and the Liberal Democrats made the strongest showing. The Communists in the Berlin election polled less than 20 per cent of the votes.⁶⁸

Other Problems. The breakdown of transportation, destruction of productive facilities, coal shortages, and inadequate food supplies to care for a population augmented beyond normal through repatriation of Germans from neighboring lands,

⁶⁸ On Allied experiments in local self-government in Germany and the results of the local elections, see *New York Times* (May 29 and June 10, 1945); and F. E. Hirsch, "German Parties—New and Old," *Current History*, N.S. X (June, 1946), pp. 509-518.

coupled with decreased acreage due to loss of territory to Poland, placed the German people in a critical situation. In spite of reduction of the daily diet to 1,250 calories per person per day, heavy imports of foodstuffs from America and Britain continued to be necessary.

By the end of 1945, most of the 18 to 20 millions of displaced persons in Germany had been returned to their homelands. However several hundred thousands of stateless persons and political refugees continued to be supported by the western Allies because of reluctance to send them to almost certain death by returning them to the countries which claimed them.⁶⁹

RECENT TRENDS

Postwar Germany. By the spring of 1948, the conflict of the Great Powers over the prostrate body of defeated Germany had emerged brutally and frankly into the open. Two Conferences of Foreign Ministers had been held in 1947, one in March and the other in the late fall. The struggle between the bloc of Western Allies and the Soviet Union and her satellites for control of Germany was only one phase of the world-wide contest going on but, because of the future potentialities of the German people, was crucial. For three years after the close of hostilities, the inability of the occupying powers to get along had become more and more apparent. Both sides failed to carry out their commitments under the Potsdam Declaration. The widely divergent ideological and power aims of the contending groups made the consummation of final peace less and less possible. It became obvious that the hopes of the German people for withdrawal of the occupying forces and restoration of their government to German hands would not be accomplished soon.

At the Moscow Conference in the spring of 1947, the conflict of aims was revealed in the proposals for establishment of a national German government. The American plan called for a federal government of a decentralized character, with power

⁶⁹ For additional material on this section, see J.P.C. Carey, "Displaced Populations in Europe with Particular Reference to Germany," *Department of State Bulletin*, XII (March 25, 1945), pp. 491-500; G. Hill, "Job of Running Germany Harder Than Expected," *New York Times* (June 10, 1945); and Blair Bolles, "Germany Defeated—But German Problem Remains," *Foreign Policy Bulletin*, XXIV (May 15, 1945).

largely residing in the states yet not so much so as to prevent fairly effective government on a national level. The object was to enable Germany to get back on her feet and manage her own affairs, but also to prevent the danger of concentration of power in the hands of military leaders who might use it to precipitate another war. In this the United States was supported largely by the British, but the French demurred. In their extreme fear of further aggression by Germany, the French insisted upon the internationalization of the Ruhr Valley and the breaking of the country into entirely separate states.

The U.S.S.R., on the other hand, adamantly demanded a highly centralized national government with supreme powers over the states. The Russian purpose seemed to be to establish a form of government at Berlin, whence the Soviet system could be imposed upon all parts of Germany. These diametrically opposed objectives make agreement impossible and the Conference collapsed. At the London Conference held in the late Fall of 1947, the evident intention of the Kremlin was to prevent agreement except on terms which would secure all of the Soviet's major aims. In consequence, Secretary Marshall broke up the Conference. Thus the making of a final peace treaty for Germany seemed indefinitely postponed.

Meantime, the Western Allies endeavor to strengthen their economic merger of the British and American zones was effected and steps taken to persuade the French to join "Bizonia." The level of production was successively raised in this area from the minimum envisaged by the Potsdam Declaration to a point estimated to enable the German people to produce enough to support a decent standard of living.

Allied ideological aims were furthered by reorganization of the schools, elimination of pro-Nazi textbooks, and replacement of teachers of questionable views with those supporting democratic ideals. Further steps were taken to organize and place in German hands organs of government of a democratic type. United States authorities divided the American zone into three states or *Laender* (Bavaria, Wuerttemberg-Baden, and Greater Hesse), none of which followed historical lines. Within these newly erected states, local governments were created beginning at the *Gemeinde* (township) level and extending on up through the various strata of German local government (*Landkreise*, *Stadtkreise*, *Regierungsbezirk*, and *Land*). By gradual stages, each unit was given

authority to deal with all pertinent problems subject only to supervision and veto of their acts by occupation authorities.

By June, 1946, the *Land* governments had been staffed with German officials and authorized to carry on the affairs of government. Capitols were established at Munich (Bavaria), Stuttgart (Wuerttemberg-Baden), Darmstadt (Hesse-Nassau), and Marburg (Hesse). American military authorities were withdrawn and replaced by AMG personnel. Early in 1946, popular elections were held to elect officials for the various local governments. In June, delegates were chosen by popular vote to constitutional conventions for the purpose of drawing up popular constitutions for the *Land* governments.

Late in 1946, these constitutions, prepared with the advice of American authorities, were submitted to popular vote and accepted by large majorities: under provisions of these instruments, parliamentary forms of democratic government were created. Each *Land* had a Minister-President elected by the *Landtag* (legislature) and a Cabinet appointed by and removable by the *Landtag*. The legislature was unicameral except in Bavaria. In Wuerttemberg-Baden and Greater Hesse both Minister-President and Cabinet could be removed by the legislature. Each constitution was provided with an elaborate Bill of Rights.

By early 1948, Anglo-American plans for consolidation of Western Germany were far advanced. Decisions reached by British and United States authorities regarding the "economic" administration of "Bizonia" provided for (1) a State Council or Upper House consisting of two representatives from each state in the American and British zones named by the respective governments of those states; (2) a Lower House of 104 members chosen by the state parliaments with extensive powers over economic matters and the ability to override vetoes of the Upper House; (3) a High Court of ten members sitting at Cologne chosen by British and American military governors from a list of twenty-five submitted by the two Houses; (4) an Executive Committee consisting of a Chairman and five Directors, heading five Bizonal departments, chosen by the Lower House and confirmed by the Council of States; (5) a Solicitor General chosen by the two military governors. Though this set-up looked suspiciously like a government for Western Germany, the Anglo-American allies rejected all Soviet protests as regards its creation.

In the western zones, the occupation authorities endeavored to

further organization of voluntary, pro-democratic political parties. Developing slowly at first, a number of them took on a national character. By 1948, the outstanding parties were the Social Democratic Party, the Christian Democratic Union, the Communist Party, and the Liberal Democratic Party. In the western zones, the Social Democratic Party and the Christian Democratic Union had secured support of about 70 per cent of the voters. The Communist vote had dropped to about 10 per cent of the popular vote.

In the Soviet zone, on the other hand, Soviet authorities secured the elimination of the Social Democratic Party and attempted to fuse its members with the Communists to form the Social Unity Party. The united group commanded about 50 per cent of the popular vote in the Soviet zone while the Christian Democrats and Liberals were able to secure about 25 per cent each of the vote of the electorate. The situation was unstable, however, because of pressure by the U.S.S.R. against the non-Communist Parties.

Considering the handicaps under which they were working, these German parties were showing surprising vigor. Of particular concern to them was the question of re-establishment of a German national government. All parties supported this proposal and linked it with the expressed desire for representative institutions. In this latter particular, the Christian Democrats sponsored a two-house legislature and an independent executive. The Social Democrats, on the other hand, wanted a one-house parliament, strictly limited in its powers. They emphasized the need for complete socialization of all major means of production.

Voluntary labor unions were also growing in numbers and strength in the western zones. Released from the hampering restrictions of Nazi laws and encouraged by allied authorities, the labor unions were able by their hunger strikes and demonstrations to compel recognition by German officials of their needs.

What of the Future? The victimization of the German people by the voracious struggle of the erstwhile victorious allies for world domination was becoming ever more apparent. Neither side could afford to yield for fear that the tremendous potential power of the German people would be utilized by the other to turn the tide of battle. Until the basic issues between the contending power groups were settled, the fate of Germany must remain in the balance. Both sides were anxious to remain in Germany

long enough to make secure their hold on the German people and prevent developments adverse to their own national safety. As the split became wider, the hopes of German leaders for resoration of the German nation receded further and further in the distance. It appeared not unlikely that the fate of the Soviet zone of Germany would be to be further communized until it was finally made a part of the Soviet constellation of satellite states while the western zones would be united and added to the bloc of pro-Allied states of Western Europe.

In fact, by the spring of 1948, the showdown between the United States and the U.S.S.R. was turning out to be a showdown on Europe. Originally, the Soviet commander wanted to force the United States out of Berlin, an island in the Soviet zone, by starving the Americans out and aimed to accomplish this by interrupting the American supply route to Berlin. Communist-controlled propaganda was telling Germans that the British and Americans were using the capital for a center of espionage and political plots; the Russian representatives walked out, in Gromyko's manner in the United Nations, of the Allied Control Council, supreme four-power authority on Germany under the Potsdam Agreement. Fortunately, the United States commanding general stood up to the Soviet commander, but the possibility of having these heckling tactics, interruptions in travel and supply, turn eventually into a shooting war was lurking behind the horizon.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BRECHT, A., *Federalism and Regionalism in Germany* (London: Oxford University Press, 1945). Acutely examines plans to divide Germany regionally.
- , *Prelude to Silence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1944). An authoritative exposition of events leading to and following the fall of the Weimar Republic.
- CHANDLER, A. B., *Rosenberg's Nazi Myth* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1945). Penetrating analysis of a great illusion.
- EBENSTEIN, W., *The German Record, A Political Portrait* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1945). An interesting and valuable appraisal of the German character.
- , *The Nazi State* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1943). Comprehensive and authoritative.

- FRAENKEL, E., *The Dual State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941). A brilliant analysis of the impact of national socialism on the German system of law and the courts.
- FREDBORG, A., *Behind the Steel Walls* (New York: Viking, 1944). An on-the-scene newspaperman's account of conditions in Germany between 1940 and 1944.
- HEIDEN, K., *A History of National Socialism* (New York: Knopf, 1935). The record of the Nazi Party by an informed observer.
- HILL, N., and STOKE, H., *The Background of European Governments* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1940). Contains much valuable source material on Germany.
- HITLER, A., *Mein Kampf* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1939).
- LOWENSTEIN, K., "Government and Politics in Germany" in J. T. Shotwell et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940). Well organized, informative, and fairly up-to-date.
- MICKLEM, N., *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939). An able treatment of this subject up to 1939.
- MUNK, F., *The Legacy of Nazism* (New York: Macmillan, 1943). Describes the expansion of the Nazi economic system over Europe.
- MURPHY, R. E., et al., *National Socialism* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943). Presents both the documents and an excellent summary of Nazi political theories.
- NATHAN, OTTO, *The Nazi Economic System* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1944). Thoroughly examines the economics of the Nazi regime over the entire period of its existence.
- NEUMANN, F., *Behemoth* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942). Contains an excellent analytical treatment of Nazi aims and objectives.
- , *Permanent Revolution* (New York: Harper, 1942). A thorough and able study of the Nazi Party and the dictatorship.
- POLLOCK, JAMES KERR, *Germany Under Occupation: Illustrative Material: and Documents* (Ann Arbor: George Wahr, 1947). Valuable commentary on recent events in Germany. Also for documents.
- RAUSCHNING, H., *The Revolution of Nihilism* (New York: Alliance Book, 1939). Analyzes Nazi revolutionary aims and objectives.
- ROBERTS, S. H., *The House That Hitler Built* (New York: Harper, 1938). Emphasizes the economic aspects of the Nazi regime.
- TREVOR-ROPER, HUGH REDWALD, *The Last Days of Hitler* (New York: Macmillan, 1947). Brings us up to date on this interesting phase of Hitler's life.
- VERMEIL, EDMOND, *The Three Reichs, Their History and Culture* (London: Dakers, trans., 1945). Traces the transition of the German people from an empire to a dictatorship.

ZINK, HAROLD, "American Military Government Organization in Germany," Chapter VII, pp. 329-349, in David Fellman, Ed., *Post-War Governments of Europe* (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publ. Co., 1946). The best recent survey of this subject.

SOVIET RUSSIA

Although both the Soviet Union and the United States encompass vast territories with extensive regional differences, their governments, rooted in widely variant historical traditions and cultural usages, are more easily recognized for their dissimilarities than for their likenesses. Like the United States, the Soviet government is federal in form. But that is about as far as the analogy holds because the party dictatorship and the extensive controls necessitated by national planning have required close supervision by the central government over practically every aspect of the political affairs of the member republics and their constituent parts. There is little room for local political autonomy such as prevails in the United States. Although the constituent republics are theoretically free to withdraw from the union, actually they are bound to support the dictatorship. Even their constitutions in their monotonous uniformity bear the stamp of their common origin.

In theory, the national and republican governments rest upon the masses of the people but, in fact, practically all powers are concentrated in the leaders of the Kremlin. This results from the monopoly of political power by the Communist Party and the legal prohibitions against all opposing parties or groups. In consequence, only well-trying adherents of the party have a chance to run for and win office. Because of their positions of leadership in the party and in the government, Stalin and his colleagues control the course of governmental and political affairs. Hence, although governmental powers are vested by the constitution in a bicameral legislature composed of representatives of the people and the various governmental areas, its members all belong to the same party and are all loyal to Stalin, who has a lifetime hold on power through his position in the party. Thus, the U.S.S.R. is neither federal nor a representative democracy according to western standards.

GEOPOLITICAL FACTORS

With a population now estimated at close to 200 millions,¹ a great system of industry, a vast expanse of cultivated land, and huge deposits of minerals and petroleum, much of which remains undeveloped, the U.S.S.R. will, without question, become one of the most powerful nations on earth. Elimination of Germany and Japan as threats to national security on her eastern and western frontiers permits concentration on internal problems. Located on territory comprising one-sixth of the land area of the globe, and in an enviable geocentric position dominating the world's largest contiguous land mass, comparatively free from attack from north and south, yet able to move without opposition to the outer limits of her great European-Asiatic base, the U.S.S.R. has the requisites for attaining the utmost practical political and economic security of which a modern national state is capable. As one of the five leading members of the United Nations, the U.S.S.R. will have much to say as regards the peace settlements and world organization for peace.

RUSSIA UNDER THE TSARS

Imperial Russia entered the twentieth century as an absolute monarchy, steeped in medieval traditions and cursed with anachronistic political institutions based upon the age-old tradition of the unlimited power of the Tsar and sanctioned by religion, law, and custom. Though in traditional theory all powers were vested in the Tsar, in practice his powers were exercised in large part by a bureaucracy, drawn from the nobility and enjoying a vested, privileged position. The Tsar's ministers, selected by him according to his own free choice, often exercised great powers individually but never achieved that group leadership characteristic of western parliamentary systems. Until 1905, no national, representative legislative body existed in Russia. The provincial zemstvos, created under Alexander II in 1864, were dominated largely by government officials and land holders but, even so, became the principal centers of demands for liberal

¹ Including territorial acquisitions resulting from the war. See A. Grajdanzev, "Labor in the Post-War Reconstruction of the Soviet Union" in *The U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction* (New York: American-Russian Institute, 1944), pp. 126-127.

reform.² Western forms of democracy and self government were unknown in practice and were just beginning to be studied by liberal elements.

Although serfdom was abolished in 1861, removal of all restrictions on freedom of the lower classes was only beginning to be accomplished between 1906 and 1911 under the Stolypin land reforms. Onerous discriminations were prescribed against the Jews. The Greek Orthodox Church, as the established religion enjoying a privileged position, cooperated with the despotic regime, using religion to lull dissatisfied elements into inactivity. The landed nobility and rich peasants supported the government's policy of keeping the lower peasantry in a condition of semi-servitude.

Progress towards industrialization in the last half of the nineteenth century led to the rise of cities and growth of an urban proletariat who were oppressed by an illiberal legal system and exploited by an increasingly powerful business class which exercised more and more influence over the government.³ The bulk of the population, living on farms which they were forbidden to own, suffered from privation, economic depression, antiquated tools and methods of tillage, heavy indebtedness to the landlords and various forms of discriminatory legislation. Hence, both peasants and city workers, repressed, spied upon and harried by police, were perpetually discontented and prone to revolt.

Growth of Opposition to the Regime. In this atmosphere of thoroughgoing autocracy where the ruling class made a point of crushing every popular movement which might offer any possible threat of liberal reform, early resistance leaders and groups were necessarily either driven underground or exiled. Achieving considerable momentum prior to 1850, revolutionary protests against the despotic regime increased in volume and in violence in the last half of the century. Among the leaders of pre-Marxian revolutionary activity, three were outstanding: Alexander Herzen (1812-1870), Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), and N. G. Chernyshevsky (1828-1889). Herzen, a romanticist and pacifist, was driven abroad where he conducted his diatribes against the government by writing and publication of a radical magazine, *The Bell*. Reaching the height of his influence in 1861, at the time of

² H. von Eckardt, *Russia*, tr. by C. A. Phillips (New York: Knopf, 1932), pp. 189-190.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 239-241.

the emancipation of the slaves, Herzen became one of the fore-runners of the Norodniki movement.

Bakunin, founder of Russian anarchism and nihilism, was an active revolutionary from the beginning. Most of his life was spent in prison or in exile. Preaching doctrines of absolute overthrow of all institutions of established authority, Bakunin became the heart and center of much of Russia's revolutionary and terroristic activities prior to 1890. Chernyshevsky, a profound writer and thinker, advanced radical criticisms of the system of private enterprise, particularly for its favoritism towards owners of private property and its absence of plan. In opposition to Marx, he placed great emphasis upon the factor of human personality in social change and favored greater utilization of the peasant communal organization as a means of mitigating the class struggle.

The revolutionary group, "Land and Liberty," stemmed from the activities of these leaders and became a powerful movement in the sixties and seventies. Assassination of Alexander II in 1881 by members of "People's Liberty," terrorist branch of "Land and Liberty," resulted in capture of most of the leaders of the latter group and its breakup. "To the People," an organization consisting largely of students and led by Bakunin and Kropotkin, endeavored to preach reform to the peasants during this period but its efforts were coldly received and it also was broken up. Increased industrialization and rise of an urban proletariat led to readier acceptance of Marxian doctrines and formation of unions of laboring groups in the larger industrial centers. In 1898, the first Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party was held. Persecution of its leaders, including Lenin, in Russia, drove them to Germany, and later to Switzerland where they published in 1900, the revolutionary magazine, *The Spark*.⁴

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, opposition party groups began to take form. Principal among these were: (1) the liberals, composed largely of enlightened business men, professional people, landed gentry, and politicians of the zemstvos. This group sought, under the monarchy, to secure reforms based on ideals of western democracy. Influential in the provinces, the liberals did not form an organized party until 1905 when they

⁴ Cf. W. H. Chamberlin, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Macmillan, 1935), Vol. I, pp. 22-37; H. von Eckardt, *op. cit.*, p. 196 ff.; and Bernard Pares, *A History of Russia* (New York: Knopf, 1926), p. 371 ff.

became known as the Constitutional Democratic Party or the Cadets. This was the party, in 1917, of Kerensky and the Provisional Government. (2) The Social Revolutionary Party, organized in the nineties, made its appeal particularly to the peasants. Finding little response to its demand for governmental reforms, the Revolutionaries took their stand on the demand for redistribution of the land to the peasants. Coalescing with the Bolsheviks, in 1917, this party played an important part in the great upheaval. (3) The Social Democratic Party, led by Lenin and Trotsky, based its principles upon the theories of Marx. From its inception, the Socialist Party was banned by the government, and forced to carry on its activities in exile throughout most of the pre-revolutionary period. However, connections with labor and socialist groups in the homeland were maintained and their forces were rapidly consolidated when the time came. Advocating establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants by means of a revolution engineered by an elite of professionally trained revolutionaries, Lenin secured support of a majority of the party leaders who became known as Bolsheviks (or majority) and, later, Communists, in contrast to the Mensheviks (or minority) who stood for peaceful change.⁵

The Reforms of 1905. Startled out of his stupid opposition to liberal reforms by the rude shock of defeat in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5, growing rebellion in the armed forces, spreading strikes in the cities, and demands for change by liberal parties, Nicholas II suddenly announced the granting of a new putatively democratic constitution. Besides granting fundamental civil rights, the Tsar's ukase pledged extension of the suffrage and creation of a democratically elected lawmaking body.

The new constitution could hardly satisfy liberal and radical elements for very long. Under its provisions, the Tsar remained the supreme autocratic power. The Duma, fairly representative at first, was soon deprived of its representative character. The ministers remained under the sole control of the Tsar. By emer-

⁵ For further material on the revolutionary groups, see W. H. Chamberlin, *op. cit.*, Ch. II; H. von Eckardt, *op. cit.*, pp. 203-210, and 223 ff. For a brief summary of the pre-revolutionary period, see H. Pratt, *Russia: From Tsarist Empire to Socialism* (New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1937), Ch. 4; M. Karpovitch, *Imperial Russia, 1801-1917* (New York: Holt, 1932), Chs. 2 and 3. For greater detail, W. H. Chamberlin, *ante*, is best. A good summary of Russian authoritarian and anarchist doctrines is to be found in F. W. Coker, *Recent Political Thought* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1934), Ch. VII, and pp. 436-439.

agency decrees, the Emperor and his heads of departments could suspend the constitution and carry on the government alone.⁶

World War I and the Russian Revolution. Any good the limited reforms of 1905 might have done in promoting liberal democracy was thwarted by the outbreak of World War I. The crisis rapidly revealed the unreadiness of the nation both in preparedness and in morale. The test of battle exposed to public gaze the pitiful inadequacy of provisions to transport, supply, and arm the men in the field. Quarrels between the bureaucracy and the army increased the confusion which the weak emperor and his scheming consort proved totally unable to handle. Defeats of the Russian armies plus revelation of the crafty Rasputin's dominating position in the court unleashed the forces of discontent. Professional revolutionaries both at home and in exile took advantage of the disintegrating movement to spread disaffection. A Progressive Bloc organized in the Duma took unexpected initiative in criticizing the inefficient conduct of the war only to alienate public opinion still further, especially among the middle classes. Outbreak of strikes and food riots in urban centers in February, 1917, demonstrated the complete helplessness of the government. The Progressive Bloc set up a Provisional Government and requested the Tsar to abdicate, aiming at creation of a liberal democracy.

Meanwhile revolutionaries began organizing soviets of soldiers, sailors and workers over the country. Under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, the extreme radicals appealed to the war-weariness of the people and the desire of peasants for land. They pledged an immediate end to the war, division of the land among the peasantry, and bread.⁷

Shifts to the left by the Provisional Government brought the Menshevik leader Alexander Kerensky into power and additional Socialist representation into the Cabinet but these moves failed to stem the massive tide of revolution. The Bolshevik leaders organized an All-Union Congress of Soviets, staged impressive street demonstrations, and propagandized the army and

⁶ For a more detailed treatment of this subject see M. T. Florinsky, "Russia—the U.S.S.R.," in J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), p. 757 ff.

⁷ Cf. G. Vernadsky, *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Holt, 1932), p. 63; and S. N. Harper, *The Government of the Soviet Union* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1937), pp. 28–29.

navy. Defeated in the attempted coup of July 1, 1917, the Soviets profited by the growing economic and military disorganization, the Kornilov rebellion, and gradual shift of peasant and labor masses to the Socialist cause. By October, disaffection in the military forces enabled the Bolsheviks to take over the government with hardly a struggle.⁸

COMMUNIST IDEOLOGY

Russian Communist doctrine is derived from the scientific socialism of Karl Marx, modified by ideas of the fathers of the Soviet state, Lenin and Stalin. Marxian teachings are founded upon a subversion of Hegelian dialectics and, for purposes of elementary study, may be considered under the heads of (1) dialectical materialism; (2) economic interpretation of history; (3) class warfare; (4) concentration of wealth; (5) dictatorship of the proletariat; and (6) the withering away of the state.

(1) *Dialectical Materialism*. Influenced by Hegel's notion of the conflict of opposites in ideas, and Darwin's doctrine of survival of the fittest, Marx posited a material world where goods are scarce and life is a struggle for power to acquire and control life's necessities and luxuries.

(2) *Economic Interpretation of History*. In contravention to fascist doctrine, Marx saw in social evolution the operation solely of material and economic forces. Human beings, he believed, place economic goods which produce wealth, power, and immediate satisfactions in the highest order of values. Morality and religion are utilized or created by ruling classes in order to rationalize, justify, or defend their control over the economic and political order of a given community. All cultural developments and institutions, Marx asserts, must be explained in terms of the struggle of human individuals, groups, and classes to increase their share of available economic goods.⁹

(3) *Class Warfare*. As society progresses to higher cultural levels, human groups are merged into comparatively fixed classes with interests in common. Basic interests are economic and involve a

⁸ Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64.

⁹ Cf. L. Haney, *History of Economic Thought* (New York: Macmillan, 1928), pp. 443, 446; and F. W. Coker, *op. cit.*, Ch. II.

struggle between classes for the limited supply of available goods. The State represents the organized power of the community controlled by and representative of the dominant classes and their economic interests at a given time.¹⁰

Society progresses from a stage of control by the few to one of control by the many. The prevailing economic system reflects the methods of exploitation of a given ruling class. Capitalism and liberal democracy represent the stage of control by the middle classes (*bourgeoisie*). Behind the facade of democratic liberties, according to Marxians, the employing class controls the economic system which produces all essential economic values. By means of this control, capitalists are able to exploit the working classes, by paying them less for their labor than the values they create (*surplus value theory*), and to dominate the government, thus permitting enactment and enforcement of legislation protecting property values and the wealth-creating machinery under their control.¹¹

(4) *Concentration of Wealth*. Capitalism, however, produces the seeds of its own destruction. Exploitation of the workers results in concentration of wealth in the hands of the few which leads to overproduction and underconsumption of goods. Periodic depressions tend to grow more and more serious as capitalism reaches the stage of maturity. Attempts of capitalists to find markets abroad for their surplus wealth and manufactured goods leads to imperialism and war.

(5) *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*. Increasing struggle between the propertied few and the masses of dispossessed workers eventuates ultimately in revolution in which the workers seize power and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. This regime is one of tutelage which continues until all traces of capitalistic ideology have disappeared; classes are eliminated until only one remains—thus removing the cause of class conflict; and the masses have learned to practice the communist golden rule: from each according to his ability; to each according to his needs.

(6) *The Withering Away of the State*. When this ideal stage

¹⁰ Cf. V. I. Lenin, *State and Revolution* (New York: International Publishers, 1932), Ch. 1; and J. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question* (New York: International Publishers, 1928), pp. 17–20.

¹¹ Lenin, *op. cit.*, p. 12 ff.

shall have been reached, the State, in the sense of an agency or force to coerce the masses on behalf of a ruling class, will wither away—become no longer necessary.

COMMUNIST REVISION OF MARXIAN DOCTRINES

The basic difficulty with the Marxian system lay in the fact that while it purported to be a scientific exposition of economic processes, in reality it constituted a set of *a priori* deductions from debatable philosophical premises aimed primarily at destruction of the system of private enterprise. Accepted by the Communists as apodictic truth universally applicable, the doctrines of Marx rapidly took on a theological character to which adherents gave lip service but which in practice were found to be at times embarrassingly inapplicable to the actual situation. Extreme deviations of theory from the facts of post-revolutionary developments in the U.S.S.R. led Communist leaders to make far-reaching revisions of dogma which, though they bore the stamp of pseudo-consistency with the basic Marxian creed, permitted extensive changes in objectives. Among the most important of these were (1) the insistence of Lenin upon a proletarian-peasant coalition instead of dictatorship by the proletariat alone; (2) Lenin's doctrine of establishing socialism by means of revolution in an agrarian country before democracy had been established and where the proletariat was in small minority; (3) Lenin's decision in 1921 to revert to private capitalism; (4) abandonment by Stalin in 1924 of the doctrine of world revolution and his positing instead of "socialism in one country"; (5) modification of the Marxian conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a comparatively brief period of preparation for the "withering away of the state" to the view that the period may be indefinitely long and the proletariat state, purified of all phases of capitalistic exploitation, of course, may grow more and more powerful; (6) open rejection by Stalin of "the withering away of the state"; (7) justification of the inequality of wages in the Soviet Union by changing the principle of apportionment from Marx's dictum of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" to "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work"; and (8) recognition of the applicability of economic laws to the U.S.S.R. but their recon-

ciliation with planning by viewing the plan as a structure for applying economic laws as perceived by the leaders and applied through state action. Acceptance of Stalin by the people as apostolic successor to Marx and Lenin makes these changes in dogma readily acceptable.¹²

REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISM

The radical program of the Bolsheviks (majority) led to the elimination of the moderate Mensheviks (minority) and peasant elements soon after the October (1917) Revolution. The government then proceeded to redistribute the land among the peasants, socialize industry, abolish the price system, and make peace with Germany. Marriage and divorce were made a matter of personal choice—mere registration being all that was required. The established church was disestablished and a campaign to eliminate religion and teach atheism was undertaken. Terrorist tactics were applied against opponents of the revolution. Bolshevik leaders were persuaded for a time that the world was going Communist. However, failure of Communist propaganda abroad and collapse of production at home, coupled with the war with Poland, and civil war with the White Russian forces, compelled the new regime to shift its policies.¹³

PERIOD OF THE NEP

Lenin's announcement of a temporary retreat to capitalism was followed by restoration of the price system, and opening of free markets, in March, 1921. Private traders began to enrich themselves again, but the government continued to extend its control over large-scale industry. Agriculture, however, remained almost entirely in private hands. Under the new policy, trade expanded and prices dropped. By 1927, production had reached its prewar volume. Nevertheless, Bolshevik leaders believed

¹² For an excellent statement of Marx's doctrines, see F. W. Coker, *op. cit.* His chapter on Communist doctrines (Ch. VI), is notable. For Communist revisions of Marx, see M. T. Florinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 817-821; and same author, "Stalin and Marxian Theory," *Current History*, VIII (April, 1945), pp. 281-293.

¹³ Cf. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 77 ff. and A.L.P. Dennis, *The Foreign Policies of Soviet Russia* (New York: Dutton, 1924), Chs. III, IV, VI and XI.

that great expansion of production must take place if the regime was to survive and hold off its enemies.

Concentration upon socialism in one country was expedited by the death of Lenin in 1924 and the victory of Stalin over Trotsky, his chief rival for control of the Soviet State. Optimistic beliefs of Red leaders in an immediate world revolution were shown by the course of events to be fallacious. Stalin's policy of building socialism within the U.S.S.R. constituted another momentous shift of direction for the Soviet regime.¹⁴

Clearly, however, seizure of power was not enough. The people were not yet ready for socialism. They must be trained in socialist ideology as well as in cooperative productive endeavor. The readiness of merchants and upper-class peasants to enrich themselves under the NEP indicated the tremendous task before Communist leaders. Particularly irritating was the problem of individualized ownership of agriculture, still the predominant feature of the productive system, which blocked the way towards the socialist goal.¹⁵

THE FIVE-YEAR PLANS

Accordingly, the Soviet leaders determined upon a policy of complete socialization: ideological, industrial, agricultural, and social. In general, their plan involved (1) complete elimination of private ownership of factories and land; (2) "liquidation" of class enemies by means of imprisonment, exile, or death; (3) eradication of all capitalist ideology through monopolistic control by the State over education, the press, and other channels of information and communication; and (4) spread of anti-religious and Marxian propaganda among the masses. All of these steps were taken more or less simultaneously but principal emphasis has been placed upon reconstruction in industry and agriculture. To achieve these objectives, the first five-year plan was instituted in 1928. It established advanced goals for rapid industrialization and collectivization of agriculture along with greatly increased production under a master plan worked out by Bolshevik leaders. Except for engineers employed from abroad, the entire plan

¹⁴ M. T. Florinsky, *World Revolution and the U.S.S.R.* (New York: Macmillan, 1933), pp. 1-28, 100, 110-111.

¹⁵ L. Lawton, *An Economic History of Soviet Russia* (London: Macmillan, 1933), Vol. II, pp. 310-11, 401-404.

was to be achieved with native labor and capital equipment produced through increased output and rigid rationing of goods. Particular emphasis was placed on expansion of heavy industry. New factories, power plants and mines were developed at a rapid rate.

In agriculture, resistance of peasants to collectivization assumed monumental proportions. In order to overcome this, the government expropriated lands of rich peasants and dragooned poor peasants into entering "collectives," merging their private holdings into single cooperative enterprises. Rebellious peasants slaughtered their herds, reduced their crops, and practiced sabotage. A severe famine ensued, centering in the Ukraine, which wiped out several million Russians and led Stalin to caution party agents to temper their zeal. By 1932, more than 60 per cent of peasant farms were collectivized.

Fear of war against the U.S.S.R. by hostile neighbors caused Soviet leaders to drive ahead at a feverish pace. The second five-year plan continued expansion of heavy industry but an effort was made to devote more time and money to cultural, welfare, and educational services. By 1937, it was estimated that over 80 per cent of total production of industry was turned out by newly created plants. Expenditures on social welfare, education, housing, social security, etc., increased enormously. Real wages of workers and incomes of farmers rose for a few years, though not in proportion to capital gains, and then began to decline. Overall advances were truly remarkable but per capita output of the Soviet Union was still far behind that of leading western nations. Dobb estimates that over-all production in the U.S.S.R. was increased 185 per cent over 1928 by the first two five-year plans. The strain upon the people of capital-saving was severe while the dearth of consumer goods resulting from concentration of capital in heavy industry was continued owing to necessity for large allocations of funds to armaments production. Output in heavy industry increased from two to four times over that of 1928.¹⁶

The goal of the third five-year plan, initiated in 1939, like that of the other two, was to equal if not surpass production in Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. Primary emphasis continued to be given to the heavy industries, especially ma-

¹⁶ Maurice Dobb, *Soviet Economy and the War* (London: Routledge, 1941), pp. 5-26.

chine building, armament, and steel production. Latest methods of industrial organization and scientific manufacturing techniques were applied. Great efforts were made to increase labor productivity. By the end of the first three years a 44 per cent additional gain in industrial output was registered while national income increased 30 per cent.¹⁷ By 1940, agriculture had become 99 per cent collectivized. New land was opened up for tilling in Central Siberia which, together with more efficient farming methods and use of machinery on the collective farms, substantially increased the food supply. New steel and armaments plants were established in the Urals, along with mines and power stations, free from danger of attack. Outbreak of the war did not prevent continuation of new construction, and in spite of drafting most of the able-bodied men into the armed forces, Soviet sources reported that industrial production did not decline. Loss of the Ukraine was at least partially compensated by new Central Siberian plantations. The ability of the U.S.S.R. to stand off the Germans and provide for most of the needs of her armed forces and civilian population surprised the world. Industries in exposed areas were moved bodily eastward, ahead of the advancing Germans, and made to function with little loss of time so that the enemy's aim to cripple Russia's productive capacity was thwarted.¹⁸

GOVERNMENT UNDER THE SOVIETS

The Communist Party and the Dictatorship. Emerging from the original Social Democratic Party of Czarist Russia, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union came to constitute an elite

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-28.

¹⁸ Favorable accounts of the U.S.S.R.'s industrial and agrarian revolution are to be found in Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *Soviet Communism: A New Form of Civilization* (New York: Scribners, 1938), p. 240 ff.; M. Dobb, *op. cit.*, Chs. III-V, VII; and W. H. Chamberlin, *The Soviet Planned Economic Order* (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1931), Chs. 1-3, and pp. 144-160; more critical is A. Yugow, *Russia's Economic Front for War and Peace* (New York: Harper, 1942). For latest developments, see *The U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction* (New York: American Russian Institute, 1944), particularly W. Mandel, "Wartime Changes in Soviet Industry," pp. 89-90, and M. Van Kleeck, "Planning and Reconstruction," p. 36 ff. J. N. Hazard's chapter, "The Impact of War on Soviet Political and Economic Institutions," in H. Zink and T. Cole, *Government in Wartime Europe* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), presents an excellent summary of conditions between 1939 and 1941.

ruling class, the spearhead of the Communist revolution, organized for leadership, and with its members selected with particular regard for their loyalty, discipline, and devotion to duty. As party rules frankly state; the party constitutes the leadership of the proletarian revolution, acting under discipline to effectuate its program through all organs of the government.¹⁹

Membership in the party was subjected to rules which gave preference to industrial workers, Red Army men and collective farmers of proven loyalty to the regime. The complicated four-class system into which applicants were divided by the Party Congress of 1934 was replaced, in 1939, by a requirement that all applicants (except former members of other political parties) must be recommended by three Party members of three years standing who have known the candidates for at least one year. Persons so endorsed are accepted by the Party cell and approved by the Party committee of county or city.²⁰

Members are duty-bound to obey all rules of the party, and orders of party superiors; to study and know Communist ideology and zealously spread it among the masses; and to set an example to others both in personal conduct and at work. Special training is provided in party educational institutions established on all levels. The 1939 amendment to the rules gave members the right to criticize other members at party meetings, vote and hold office in the party, obtain information from party superiors, and defend themselves if accused of misconduct.²¹

Because the size of the Party is restricted, worthy persons have been encouraged to belong to an organization of "Sympathizers" who actively cooperate with the Party in executing its program. Soviet leaders have tried to obtain as many new Party members as possible from the ranks of the Komsomol, a youth organization of boys and girls, 14 to 23 years of age. This heavily indoctrinated group has the duty of leavening the masses of youth with Communist ideology, and supervising the Pioneers, a younger body of children, 10 to 16 years of age. Below the Pioneers are the Little Octobrists between the ages of 8 and 10. Thus, the aim is to insure training of the younger generation in the tenets of

¹⁹ W. E. Rappard, et al., *Source Book of European Governments* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1937), pt. V, pp. 34-35.

²⁰ M. T. Florinsky, "Russia—The U.S.S.R.," *op. cit.*, pp. 829-830.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 830; and R. L. Buell, et al., *New Governments of Europe* (New York: Nelson, 1937), p. 354.

the Soviet regime so that habit, inclination, belief, and zeal will combine to inspire the youth of Russia loyally to work for the success of socialism. Soviet success in this respect led fascist dictatorships slavishly to copy the youth program of the Communist Party.

Party organization begins with local Party cells of three or more members in village, factory, or workshop. Cell members supervise productive enterprises, and promote Party aims in their locality. Representatives from the cells are elected to echelons on higher regional levels, each with its Party conference, bureau and secretary, until the national level is reached. The All-Union Party Congress which meets (in theory) every three years, tops the Party hierarchy. Actual authority is delegated (again in theory) to a central committee which appoints three powerful agencies: the Secretariat, the Organization Bureau, and the Political Bureau. Stalin has occupied the office of Secretary-General since 1922, and heads the Political Bureau which includes the inner ring of most powerful Party bosses. Through these committees, whose members are designated by Stalin, the central committee exercises general supervision over all activities of both the Party and the government. Under revision of Party rules in 1939, the Committee of Party Control was subordinated to the Central Committee. This committee acts jointly with the Soviet Control Committee, raised in 1940 to the status of a full-fledged commissariat. In this way Party and government were linked together.²²

Stalin's position as leader of the Party enabled him, through his control over Party members who predominated on all national governmental agencies and exercised great influence on government policy on all levels, to wield dictatorial authority, until 1940, though he occupied no official governmental post. When the war broke out, however, he evidently felt that this control was not sufficiently direct because he took over the premiership and made himself supreme commander-in-chief of the armed forces.²³

The Party Line and the Purges. Under Party rules, members were sworn to adhere to Party policy, once it had been adopted by

²² Cf. R. L. Buell, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-359; Florinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 824-826, 830-831; and Hazard, *op. cit.*, p. 132

²³ D. J. Dallin, *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939-1942* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), p. 382.

the leadership. Discussion and criticism, if constructive, was permitted prior to its adoption, but once decided upon, no deviation was permitted from the Party line. Suggestions as to detailed applications of policies were encouraged, especially among workers in fields and factories but not proposals which would block or deflect agreed-upon objectives. Adoption of a one-party system, however, did not prevent factional conflicts. Frequent purges of non-compliant members resulted, starting with expulsion of the Mensheviks, then of Trotsky in 1924, followed by a number of minor purges between 1924 and 1933.

Desire of Stalin to strengthen his position and close ranks before the menace of war, resulted in a wholesale purge of Party members of all ranks between 1934 and 1938. As a result of the political murder of S. M. Kirov, friend of Stalin and a member of the Political Bureau, hundreds of high-ranking members of the party, government, and military forces were investigated, forced or persuaded to confess disloyal, seditious or traitorous acts, tried in the high courts, and sentenced to be imprisoned or executed. In this way, most Old-Guard Bolsheviks were eliminated. New leaders were mostly of the younger generation, trained under the soviet system. The effect of this wholesale purge upon rank and file of Party and people was so demoralizing that the Party Congress, meeting in 1939, changed Party rules to redefine the rights of Party members, shorten terms of office, and increase the power of local Party organizations over local economic affairs. Annual conferences of local Party organizations on a national level were also encouraged.²⁴

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Organized in 1919, and composed of Communist parties in all countries, the Third International was actually an instrument of the All-Union Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. to spread its propaganda abroad. Headquarters were in Moscow and Party congresses were held there. Hence Soviet leaders were in a position to exercise predominating influence, though the Soviet government persistently denied that it was in any way connected with the Comintern. Announcement by Stalin of dissolution of the Third International by its Congress on May 22, 1943, how-

²⁴ W. Duranty, *The Kremlin and the People* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), Chs. II-VI.

ever, indicated the close relationship between this body and the Soviet regime, since Stalin's obvious purpose was to free the U.S.S.R. from the taint of the Red terror, and make possible closer rapprochement with England and the United States.²⁵

THE CONSTITUTION

The vast bulk of the U.S.S.R. with its large number of different nationalities has always necessitated recognition of regional and cultural differences. In the reaction against the Czarist "russification" policy, the Communist regime sought to secure support by granting the right of each nationality to autonomy, while at the same time it ruthlessly crushed attempts of oppositionist elements to establish independent governments. Membership of national groupings in the Union was considered voluntary and the right of secession was granted both in the 1924 and 1936 constitutions.

In form, the U.S.S.R. is a federal state, like the United States and Switzerland, with all powers not delegated to the federal government retained by the constituent republics. A number of significant differences, however, make Russia a system almost totally unlike other federal systems. As a socialist, proletarian economy in which all forms of private property, except for small plots of land, homes, household chattels, and personal effects, has been eliminated, planning by the national government has had to replace competition as a regulator of production. Hence, it must have ample power to deal not only with political but with economic matters. The western idea of federalism therefore, which implies broad freedom for local governments from national interference in political and economic affairs, obviously cannot be applied to Soviet Russia. There, central dictatorial control over all phases of life prevails except in certain cultural spheres where the Kremlin feels it safe to permit greater freedom of action.

In the Constitution of 1936, the U.S.S.R. is given power over international relations; war and peace; admission of new republics; observance of the federal constitution by member republics; changes of boundaries of Union Republics; creation of new autonomous republics and regions; military affairs; foreign trade;

²⁵ V. M. Dean, "The U.S.S.R. and Post-War Europe," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XIX (August 15, 1943), p. 122.

internal security (police); national planning; national taxation and finance, banks, industry, agriculture, and trade of national significance; transportation and communication; money and credit; insurance and national accounting; criminal and civil law; citizenship; and amnesty acts. In addition, the U.S.S.R. can determine fundamental principles for development of the land, natural resources, education, and public health. This imposing array of powers shows clearly that local autonomy consists in the way the laws are administered rather than in a division of powers between national and local governments.

Some concession to federalism is seen in the provisions that (1) the sovereignty of Union Republics is restricted only by the powers expressly given to the national government by the constitution; (2) each Republic has the right to secede from the union; and (3) territories of Union Republics may not be changed without their consent. The right of secession, however, has become a dead letter.²⁶ More important still, amendment of the constitution is accomplished by a two-thirds vote of the Supreme Council of the U.S.S.R. (Article 146). Thus the national government alone determines the allocation of powers between itself and the Union Republics.²⁷

To the original four Socialist Soviet Republics were added seven more by 1939, making a total of eleven. These were the Russian, Byelorussian, Ukrainian, Azerbaijan, Georgian, Armenian, Turkman, Uzbek, Tadzik, Kazakh, and Kirzhiz Union Republics. As a result of Soviet intervention in Finland, the Baltic States, and Rumania in 1939-1940, the Karelian-Finnish, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Moldavian Republics were added, thus constituting, as a whole, sixteen Union Republics. There are numerous autonomous republics, provinces, and districts. Union Republics are subdivided into provinces, counties, cities and towns.²⁸

Among Union Republics, the Russian S.F.S.R. occupies a place of predominance both in terms of size, population, and of influence in Party and state. Recent amendments of the constitution

²⁶ Cf. Constitution of 1936, Arts. 14, 15; W. E. Rappard, et al., *op. cit.*, V, pp. 110-111; and Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 843.

²⁷ Rappard, *op. cit.*, V, p. 129.

²⁸ Cf. Constitution of 1936, Arts. 15-29, *loc. cit.*; and V. M. Dean, "The U.S.S.R. and Post-War Europe," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XIX (August 15, 1943), pp. 122-139. See also *The Governments of the Major Foreign Powers* (New York: U. S. Military Academy, 1945), pp. 166-167.

to permit Union Republics to exchange diplomatic representatives and make agreements with foreign states, and raise and maintain armies of their own, seem intended to relax the tight controls exercised over them by the Union government, induce other countries of eastern Europe to join the U.S.S.R., and permit membership of constituent republics in the United Nations.²⁹

The Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. Soviet governmental organs have no counterpart in western state structure. Russian precedent has been largely the determining factor. The legislative function in Russia under the Tsars remained in a state of arrested development, by western standards, and Soviet experiments have not, so far, changed the picture substantially. Soviet political theory rejects the idea of a separation of powers such as prevails in the United States, preferring to vest all powers in one central body which is differentiated into legislative and executive branches, with the executive branch, under the dictator, exercising, in practice, complete control.

The Constitution of 1936 eliminated the All-Union Congress, a huge body, established by the Constitution of 1924, of over 2,000 members chosen under conditions which gave city workers a five-to-one preference over rural sections and did little more than ratify acts of other bodies. A new body, the Supreme Council of the Union, replaced the old Central Executive Committee. Elected for a four-year term and possessing all legislative powers, this national assembly was divided into two chambers: the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities. The Council of the Union is chosen by the voters on the basis of one deputy for every 300,000 of population. Its present membership is around 647. The Council of Nationalities is representative of regional groupings and is elected by voters of each region on the basis of 25 deputies for each Union Republic, 11 for each autonomous republic, 5 for each autonomous region, and 1 for each national district. It now has 713 members.³⁰

Deputies of both houses are immune from arrest except by vote of the Supreme Council, or of the presidium if the Council is not in session. The Chambers are coequal in legislative powers.

²⁹ Cf. "Autonomy," *Information Bulletin*, U.S.S.R. Embassy, XIV, 19 (February 15, 1944), pp. 6-7; Irving Brant, "The New Russian Enigma," *New Republic*, LX (February 28, 1944), pp. 272-274; and "Autonomy and the Soviet Union" *Business Week*, No. 755 (February 19, 1944), pp. 113-116.

³⁰ *Political Handbook of the World* (New York: Harper, 1946), p. 150.

Their sessions are coterminous and are called twice a year by the presidium. Each chamber elects a chairman and two vice-chairmen. Differences between the two houses over bills are settled by a conciliation commission made up of an equal number of representatives from each chamber. If no agreement is reached by the commission, the chambers are dissolved by the presidium of the Supreme Council which fixes dates for new elections. In practice, no dissolution has so far occurred.

The presidium, under the 1936 constitution, consists of 37 members, including the chairman, vice-chairmen, and 24 members. It has been given very broad authority of a legislative, executive and judicial character. The presidium supervises the observance of the constitution; execution and interpretation of the laws; dissolves the Supreme Council and holds new elections in case of differences between the two chambers; conducts referenda on its own initiative, or on request of a single Union Republic; approves and vetoes decrees of the Council of People's Commissars, or orders of individual Commissars; awards decorations and honors; exercises power of pardon; appoints and removes the highest officers of the military forces; declares war in case of attack, or to fulfill treaty commitments, if the Supreme Council is not in session; declares general or partial mobilization; ratifies treaties; appoints and recalls diplomatic representatives, and receives foreign diplomats. In addition, the presidium acts in place of the Supreme Council when not in session; vetoes acts of Union Councils; and appoints and dismisses individual Commissars on recommendation of the Chairman of that body.

The Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. consists of the heads of the various administrative departments. It is the executive and administrative organ of the Supreme Council with power to issue decrees under legislative authorization binding upon the whole country and examine decrees of individual Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and of Commissariats of the Union Republics. It is responsible for its acts to the Supreme Council and presidium but does not go out of office as a body on vote of lack of confidence. Individual Commissars are obligated to give oral or written replies to questions addressed to them by deputies of the Supreme Council.

Commissariats are either All-Union or Union Republic. The former enforce and administer directly national laws throughout the entire territory of the U.S.S.R. covering matters delegated

to the Union, such as Foreign Affairs, Transport, Communications, Foreign Trade, Industry, Armaments, Shipbuilding, etc. Union-Republic Commissariats act through Commissariats of Union-Republics on matters delegated to the Republics, including Food, Light Industry, Agriculture, Forests, Farms, Health, Justice, etc.

Government of Constituent Republics and Local Areas. In general the same type of organization prevails in Union Republics as in the nation as a whole. The Supreme Soviet is unicameral, however, and its members are elected for a term of four years under conditions prescribed by the constitution of the Republic. Powers of this body include adoption and amendment of the constitution in conformity to provisions of the constitution of the U.S.S.R.; ratification of the constitutions and definition of the boundaries of the autonomous republics under its jurisdiction; approval of the plan and budget; and election of the Supreme Court of the Republic. As in the case of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Soviet of each Union Republic elects a presidium, the powers of which are defined in the constitution of the Republic, and a Council of People's Commissars consisting of the heads of the various departments of administration. This body has power to issue orders under laws of the Republic and decrees of the Council of Peoples Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and supervise their execution. It also has authority to suspend orders of like organs of the autonomous Republics and annul acts of Executive Committees of local Soviets. Republican Councils of People's Commissars are bound to execute laws of the U.S.S.R. and of the Union Republic.³¹ This is accomplished by means of two sets of Commissariats, one of which, the All-Union, is subordinate to corresponding Commissariats of the U.S.S.R. The other, Constituent Republic Commissariats, enforce laws of the Republic.

Local Governmental Areas. Autonomous Republics have a constitution, Supreme Council, Presidium, and Council of People's Commissars similar to those of the Union Republics. The territories, regions, districts, cities, and rural areas are governed by Soviets of Toilers' Deputies elected by the people on the usual Communist one-party ticket for a two-year term. They exercise general powers of local government. Executive Committees perform the required administrative tasks.³²

³¹ Constitution of 1936, *op. cit.*, Ch. VI.

³² *Ibid.*, Chs. VII and VIII.

The degree of standardization of governmental forms indicated in the Constitution of 1936 on national, Republic, and local levels reveals the broad difference between constitutions of American states and Republics of the Soviet Union. In the United States, state constitutions are locally originated and adopted and cover a wide range of subjects, power over which can be exercised independently of the national government. These include control over local government, but to a large degree local constitutions are the products of local initiative and local officials are independent of state control. Hence, great variations prevail in forms and function among the states. In the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, the national constitution leaves little to local initiative or innovation. Concentration of power from the top down is also shown by the hierarchical character of governmental administration. Union Soviets and Commissariats exercise supervision over those on lower levels all the way down to the primary units.

Popular Participation in Politics. Provisions of the Constitution of 1936 have removed all disabilities, religious, economic, and political, formerly applied against non-Bolsheviks, and grant universal suffrage at the age of eighteen. The only exceptions are criminals and insane. Deputies to Soviets on all levels are subject to direct election by the voters. Citizens in the armed forces also vote and run for office. Balloting is secret. Candidates for office are sponsored by Communist Party organizations, trade unions, cooperatives, cultural societies, and youth organizations. It is illegal for any party other than the official Communist organization to sponsor candidates. However factional differences within the Party sometimes appear, though these are minimized.³³ Outright opposition to government policies is forbidden in elections though criticisms of the personal conduct of candidates, or of details of their performance in office is permitted. Each incumbent running for re-election is required to give an account of his work, and political problems are called to attention of voters during campaigns. Elections are held at places of work, or in districts for non-workers, under supervision of electoral commissions established at each regional level.³⁴ Under these condi-

³³ Cf. Constitution of 1936, Arts. 126 and 141; M. T. Florinsky, *Russia—The U.S.S.R.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 854–858; and J. Stalin, *Leninism* (New York: International Publishers, 1930), pp. 50–54.

³⁴ Cf. S. N. Harper, *op. cit.*, pp. 78–84; and R. L. Buell, *op. cit.*, p. 369 ff.

tions, elections in the U.S.S.R. can hardly be said to be free in the western sense of the term.

Rights and Duties of Citizens. The Bill of Rights of the 1936 constitution goes much farther, at least on paper, than the American constitution in granting rights and privileges to the people. Not only are all personal and judicial rights substantially conceded, but the citizen is guaranteed the right to work, to rest, to social security, free education, and equal rights for women. Private property rights, however, are eliminated except for small domiciliary and personal holdings. Soviet leaders have made a real effort to achieve the goals of economic comfort stated in the constitution and, though retarded by war, have made some strides in this direction. But, so far as rights of free speech, press, association, inviolability of the person, etc., are concerned, the obvious facts belie the written word. The great problem of Russian socialism is to make economic welfare compatible with political freedom. The record of the great purge, operations of the secret police, control of the press, "liquidation" of anti-Communist associations, and the use of "labor discipline," all indicate that in these respects the Bill of Rights sets up ideals to be attained rather than accomplished facts. The duties of citizens include respect for the constitution and law of the land, observance of labor discipline and social obligations, safeguarding of state property, universal military service, avoidance of treasonable or seditious acts, and patriotic defense of the fatherland.³⁵

The Judiciary. Courts created by the Constitution of 1936 and subsequent legislation include the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R., the Supreme Courts of Union Republics, territorial and provincial courts, courts of autonomous republics and their provinces, district courts, special courts created by act of the Supreme Council of the U.S.S.R., and People's Courts. Of these, each is elected by the Soviets of their respective territorial areas for periods of five years, except the People's Courts which are chosen directly by the voters for three-year terms. No educational or other qualifications are required of any judges on any of the courts. One judge and two assessors hear cases in every court except where otherwise provided. The constitution definitely states that judges are independent and subject only to the law. However, due to their short terms of office and the fact that the per-

³⁵ Constitution of 1936, Chs. X, XI.

sonnel is recruited from the Communist Party, in practice the judiciary, like the other organs of government, are the instruments of party policy. This is more apparent in political than in ordinary cases where special courts may be created to try political offenders.³⁶ Any judge may also be recalled by the body which elected him or subjected to criminal prosecution by the State Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. with permission of the U.S.S.R. Presidium.³⁷ All courts are required by law to enforce the principles of equality before the law, right of the accused to counsel, and public hearings.

The Supreme Court reviews decisions of the lower courts and supervises their actions. It exercises original jurisdiction over conflicts between Republics, and cases of sedition or treason against the Union. It is a large court consisting of thirty or more judges sitting in civil, criminal, and military sections. Advisory opinions on constitutional questions are also rendered by this court but it has no power to declare any law or decree unconstitutional.

Principal trial courts are regional, provincial, territorial, and People's Courts. The cases heard descend in importance from the regional courts down to the People's Courts which try less serious issues. People's Courts are presided over by a judge and two assessors selected from lists prepared by local Soviets.³⁸ Laws administered by the Courts have now been thoroughly recodified and socialized. They are frequently revised. Severe punishment for political offenses is balanced by application of the theory of rehabilitation in criminal cases. Economic disputes are settled mainly by special arbitration boards.

Enforcement of the laws and supervision of the Courts rests with the Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R., appointed by the Supreme Council for a period of seven years. Prosecutors on all other levels are appointed by the Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. for seven-year terms, except district and urban prosecutors who are appointed by similar officials of Union Republics with the approval of the Prosecutor of the U.S.S.R. Thus law enforcement is much

³⁶ Cf. Constitution of 1936, Ch. IX; Walter Duranty, *op. cit.*, Ch. III; M. T. Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 849 ff; and A. S. Spectorov, "When Soviet Citizens Go To Court," *Information Bulletin*, Embassy of U.S.S.R., V (March 10, 1945), p. 7. For further material on ordinary justice in the courts see Spectorov and M. S. Calcott, *Russian Justice* (New York: Macmillan, 1935), Chs. V-IX.

³⁷ M. T. Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 850.

³⁸ See A. S. Spectorov, *op. cit.*

more highly centralized in the U.S.S.R. than in the United States.

The Secret Police. The judicial protection provided by the regular system of courts does not apply to political offenders accused of counter-revolutionary or "wrecking" offenses against the regime. These may be apprehended by the state secret police, subjected to summary secret trial, and executed. The handling of cases in the treason trials during the great purge is an excellent example of this technique.³⁹

Armed Forces. Starting as a Red Militia under the control of War Commissar Trotsky in 1917 and trained to function as the armed vanguard of the "world revolution," the Red Army ran the gamut from a force in which discipline and subordination to superior authority was relegated to the dump heap, through various stages of development. Today, after having profited by industrial advances of the U.S.S.R. and restored authority and discipline, it has become perhaps the most powerful military organization in the world. Conscription consistently applied to Russia's huge population permitted training of vast numbers of men. Improvement in educational standards of officers and men was reflected in military personnel as time went on. The standing army in 1935 of 1,300,000 men was increased by 1939 to over 5,000,000 men in the infantry alone. The wartime draft of all male citizens between the ages of 16 and 50 enabled the U.S.S.R. to put into the field an army of nearly 20,000,000 men in field and reserve units. Anxiety of the regime regarding loyalty of the army was manifested by the institution of political commissars in army units whose duties were to check on subversive elements and spread Communist propaganda. Abolished in 1940, they were restored in 1941 and abolished again in 1942. The great purge of 1936-1938 removed most non-Communists from ranks of high officers while recruits from the Komsomols filled the lower ranks.⁴⁰ The Red Navy at the end of World War II was still small but in process of expansion. The Air Force had grown into a powerful organization second only to that of the United States.⁴¹

The U.S.S.R. in World War II. The Nazi attack upon the U.S.S.R. in 1941 compelled the Soviet Union to divert its produc-

³⁹ E. Lyons, *Stalin, Czar of All The Russias* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1940), Chs. XXII-XXIV.

⁴⁰ D. F. White, *The Growth of the Red Army* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), Ch. X; and *Governments of the Major Foreign Powers, op. cit.*, pp. 184-186.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

tive energies to the life-and-death struggle with fascism. From a normal expenditure for defense of about one-tenth of its budget, armaments costs gradually increased to about one-third in 1940, climbing, by 1945, to nearly 50 per cent.⁴²

Large areas in European Russia and the Ukraine were overrun and devastated by both Russian and German armies. Factories, power stations, mines, dams, and village industries were destroyed. Livestock was killed or carried away, food supplies seized, crops destroyed, schools, museums, libraries, and institutions of higher learning burned, or used for military purposes. Hundreds of thousands of men and women were carried away to Germany for labor service. Millions of men were killed or wounded in battle, and millions more diverted from productive, peacetime pursuits into the armed services. Brutality, starvation, and disease wrecked the lives of thousands, raising grave problems of health.⁴³ As the German tide was stopped at Stalingrad and ebbed slowly back from Russian soil, the Soviets began to plan and work to reconstruct the devastated areas while the war was still going on.

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND POSTWAR RECONSTRUCTION

Socialist Planning. The automatic controls of demand, supply, and price, which are supposed to maintain the private enterprise system on an even keel, do not operate in the Soviet type of socialist economy where land and capital are collectivized and production for profit is abolished. Hence, the productive factors of land, labor, and natural resources must be coordinated under a national plan in order to achieve maximum results as determined by the planners. In the U.S.S.R., this function is in charge of the State Planning Commission (Gosplan), successor to the Supreme Economic Council, and now a department of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. Similar planning agencies exist on each level of government and in each major department. General principles of the plan to be adopted are

⁴² V. D. Kazakevich, "Financing War and Reconstruction," in the *U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction*, *op. cit.*, p. 148 and "The Soviet Budget of 1945," *Information Bulletin*, Embassy of U.S.S.R., V (May 22, 1945), p. 3.

⁴³ Cf. V. Lebedenko, "Introduction," *op. cit.*, p. 8 ff. Also see files of *Information Bulletin*, U.S.S.R. Embassy, from January to July, 1943, for numerous examples.

outlined by principal party and government leaders embodying their basic policy decisions and transmitted to the Gosplan. The latter, using the vast array of data at its disposal, prepares a unified plan which is referred back to supreme leadership for approval, then sent through the channels until it reaches production levels for criticisms and suggestions. These criticisms are sent back to the Gosplan where, with approval of the Kremlin, final decisions are made and orders to proceed issued to all agencies of production via the intermediary agencies. In order to expedite this process many plants have been given the right to work out their own production programs subject to check by the Trust or the People's Commissariat which exercises supervision over them. The Gosplan also issues general directives for annual production on its own authority, thus short-circuiting the roundabout process outlined above.

National planning on the scale employed by the U.S.S.R. marks a new departure in economics and naturally has provoked much discussion and considerable emulation. Criticisms directed at the Soviet experiment have revolved about the question of whether national planning is possible—that is to say, whether the U.S.S.R. really has what may be called a plan and, if so, whether it is preferable to the so-called automatic controls of the system of private enterprise. Defined, as Dobb puts it, as “the coordinating mechanism of the economy” which sets up production goals and endeavors to supervise their successful execution in detail, national planning, as most economists agree, is not only possible but advantageous in many ways over capitalism. However, they point out many difficulties in the way such as imperfect knowledge of consumer's wants or unwillingness to satisfy them, mistakes of judgment as to quantities of various goods to be produced, technological changes, war, acts of nature, and uncertainties of human behavior.⁴⁴

Soviet planning under the five-year plans aimed at complete socialization of industry and agriculture, and substantial raising of the living standards of the population. Critics point out serious errors in planning, such as overbuilding of industrial plants and

⁴⁴ General works applicable here include B. Wooton, *Plan or No Plan* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1935), Chs. IV and VI; R. H. Blodgett, *Comparative Economic Systems* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), Chs. 5 and 6; G. Bienstock, et al., *Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture* (London: Oxford University Press, 1944), Ch. IV; and Maurice Dobb, *op. cit.*, Ch. IX.

underbuilding of transportation facilities to carry the products, especially railroads; lack of coordination of various phases of the plans; and uneven achievement of goals set. These failures seem to arise from inaccurate estimates of the productive capacity of labor; inefficiency of technicians and managers; retarding effects of an overbuilt bureaucracy; and such intangibles as resentment of workers and peasants at low incomes, heavy taxes, and high costs of living, and dictatorial methods of the regime.⁴⁵

To a large degree, the ability of Communist Russia to survive in the postwar world and succeed in her socialist experiment, depends upon the success of planning. The task of reconstruction covers all phases of life and, even after repairs have been made, the U.S.S.R. has still far to go before she can equal and surpass the productive capacities and living standards of advanced western nations. Nevertheless, achievements so far have been remarkable. All estimates show that, within the brief space of 20 years, the Soviets have succeeded in converting Russia from an agricultural to a highly industrialized state, advancing in capital construction at a rate much faster than that of the United States and other capitalistic countries. The tempo has been slackened somewhat in some sectors during the war but increased in others.⁴⁶

By 1944, industrial and arms production had increased several times over prewar production, while costs declined, but in agricultural output the U.S.S.R. barely held its own.⁴⁷

Planners during the war and postwar periods, working through "vertical" controls of the various commissariats, "geographical," or local, controls, and special agencies, devoted their principal attention to reconstruction of devastated areas. Plans cover restoration of wrecked mines, coal fields, farms, dams, railways, homes and schools. Latest scientific methods and artistic designs were applied to housing construction and town planning.⁴⁸

Since the war, three five-year plans have been scheduled,

⁴⁵ G. Bienstock, et al., *op. cit.*, pt. I; and A. Yugow, *op. cit.*, Ch. I.

⁴⁶ Cf. A. Yugow, *op. cit.*, pp. 15, 30-33, 49; W. Mandel, "Wartime Changes in Soviet Industry," in *U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction*, *op. cit.*, p. 91; and Maurice Dobb, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-28.

⁴⁷ See I. Benediktov, "Soviet Agriculture in Three Years of War," *Information Bulletin*, Embassy of U.S.S.R., IV (June 27, 1944), pp. 5-6; and "Soviet Industry Stands Test of War," *loc. cit.*, IV (July 15, 1944), p. 6.

⁴⁸ Cf. M. Van Kleek, "Planning and Reconstruction," *op. cit.*, p. 41 ff.; and Hans Blumenfeld, "Municipal Reconstruction," *loc. cit.*, p. 76 ff.

heralded as aiming at achieving the goal of Communism but actually purposing to liquidate all war costs, restore the devastated areas, and bring up the production of steel and other essentials both of war and peace to levels comparable by 1960 with those of the United States. Strict rationing and labor discipline will be continued as long as necessary to secure the desired ends.⁴⁹

Problems of Industry. Past experience makes the projected plan seem utopian. Overcentralization in industry has been the bane of Russian socialism. Individual industries were grouped into trusts, trusts into syndicates, and syndicates into combines, under industrial commissariats of Union and Union Republics, topped by a political dictatorship, harsh in methods, and not too patient with results. A top-heavy superstructure with responsibility divided amongst an army of bureaucrats, lost in red tape, eating up surpluses, and practicing nepotism and graft, proved unable to manage industry efficiently. Reaction against this "functional" organization led to purges and greater emphasis upon responsibility of individual plant managers. Greater supervisory powers were given to local Party and government agencies. But these measures were without notable results.⁵⁰

Lack of training of workers, technicians, engineers, and managers, was a patent cause of failure throughout. This led to faulty organization of work and division of labor, poor quality of products, frequent shutdowns, lack of coordination between plants, and eventuated in high costs. Consequent decreases in output per unit of manpower, coupled with need of the government to save capital, led to reduced wages and high prices. Slackening of work efficiency compelled the government to resort to capitalistic methods. Piece-work wages and Stakhanovism increased output somewhat but wage differentials tended to split workers into classes and restore class warfare. Fear of war in the face of slackening of labor output caused restoration of severe labor discipline in 1939-1941. Foremen were given dictatorial powers, hours increased, wages cut and criminal sanctions applied against workers who wilfully quit their jobs. These controls were not relaxed during the war, and the problems of the postwar period have necessitated their retention.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Cf. W. Mandel, *op. cit.*, p. 97; V. D. Kazakevich, *loc. cit.*, pp. 146-150; and Stalin's pre-election radio speech, press release, February 9, 1946.

⁵⁰ S. N. Harper, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-115.

⁵¹ A. Yugow, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-42, and Ch. VIII.

Industrial Education. Lack of skilled workers and technicians has caused Soviet leaders to place great emphasis upon industrial education. Compulsory education up to the age of 16 prevails in the U.S.S.R. Authority of teachers has been restored in the classrooms. Emphasis is on practical results. In 1943, separate schools were established for girls, devoting major attention to domestic arts, though not to the neglect of industrial skills.⁵² When war came, many novices were trained in the factories but bad housing and lack of discipline and of well-trained teachers detracted from success in this effort. Special State Labor Reserve Schools concentrate on training of skilled workers. These were increased to 1,700 during the war. Elementary schools and vocational high schools continued to function during the war, except where interrupted by invasion. Colleges and universities continued to operate on high levels undeterred by recently imposed tuition fees and the draft. They are turning out large numbers of scientists, engineers, and technicians to add to the productive capacities of the nation. The end of the war saw no slackening of these efforts. Instead, they were actually increased.⁵³

Problems of Collective Agriculture. Present problems in agriculture gravitate around peasant discontent at heavy exactions of the government in taxes, forcible collections, low prices for farm goods, etc. These, coupled with overstaffing of collective farm managements, caused peasant returns to drop to very low levels, and resulted in lowering of labor efficiency. Peasant demands for the right to work lands of their own forced the government to legalize this practice in the 1936 constitution. Subsequently, peasants have increased production on their private holdings (up to 2.5 acres) to substantial levels with the tacit acceptance by the regime of this capitalistic practice. State farms have not been successful on the whole. Great differences in returns on collective farms had produced class distinctions between peasants on "rich" and "poor" farms. Nevertheless, the gains of collective agriculture have been very great and the government shows no disposition to give it up. On the contrary, it is rapidly expanding collective holdings both in European and Asiatic Russia.⁵⁴

⁵² A. Grajdanzev, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

⁵³ *Ibid*, pp. 129-134

⁵⁴ A. Yugow, *op. cit.*, Ch. III; and U. Russakov, "The Strength and Vitality of the Collective Farm System," *Information Bulletin*, Embassy of U.S.S.R., V (May 8, 1945), pp. 3-4.

Soviet Workers. The great question for Soviet Russia since the war has been whether the Russian people will be willing to continue the unparalleled sacrifices they have been called upon to make during the past 20 years. Under the dictatorship, they have been deprived of the means of protecting their interests against exploitation by the Communist ruling class. The old type of trades unions were dissolved at an early stage. Workers were forced by discriminations in favor of members of Communist labor unions to join these organizations. Lagging interest of workers forced the Kremlin to extend itself to put new life into them. At present, labor unions in Russia supervise observance by factories of labor legislation; possess and administer their own resorts, rest homes, etc., where members may spend their vacations; control administration of all social security legislation; maintain cultural and educational facilities for members, and afford them legal advice; but seem to have lost the power to control wages and hours, the essentials of their well-being.⁵⁵ The list of functions is truly imposing but the fact remains that the unions cannot act independently to further the interests of labor as a group.

To the extensive list of benefits accorded to workers and their families, including vacations with pay, health protection, and social security, the U.S.S.R. has recently added large increases in state aid to mothers of large families, rising to a 5,000-ruble grant and 300 rubles per month for the birth of an 11th child. Bachelor taxes have been increased on unmarried men and women. Laws of divorce are tightened by making divorces subject to public hearings and court decisions.⁵⁶

Reversal of Policy on Religion. The facts indicate that, rather than progressing towards pure communism, the Soviet regime has been reverting in most important respects to practices of capitalism. Restoration by Stalin of the Greek Catholic Church, in September, 1943, as the established church, election of a new patriarch, provision for a Church Committee in the government for toleration of other religions, and close collaboration between the Orthodox Church and Red leaders marks a complete reversal of original Communist plans to eradicate religion. By the new

⁵⁵ "Soviet Trade Unions," *Information Bulletin*, Embassy of U.S.S.R., IV (July 18, 1944), p. 6; and G. Bienstock, et al., *op. cit.*, Ch. III.

⁵⁶ "Edict of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the Increase of State Aid for Mothers and Children," *Information Bulletin*, *op. cit.*, IV (July 25, 1944), pp. 1-5.

policy, the Kremlin secured a united domestic front for war and hopes to maintain greater unity in the peace as well as expand Soviet influence in those countries where the Orthodox Church is strong.⁵⁷ Patriotic fervor was utilized for the same purpose. Instead of whipping up enthusiasm for "world revolution," stress was laid by the government propaganda machine upon patriotic loyalty and love of the fatherland and every occasion was taken to dwell on this theme, to which the people responded with enthusiasm and devotion.⁵⁸

FOREIGN POLICIES

Prewar Period. Soviet foreign policies from 1917 to the present have been directed toward three major objectives: (1) national security, (2) recovery of lost territories, and (3) expansion of Soviet influence in Europe, Asia and the rest of the world.

In order to achieve security, it was necessary at first to defeat internal enemies, who were engaged in civil war against the Bolsheviks with French, British and American support, and organize a strong federal union of Soviet Republics. When the civil war ended, severe tension between the Soviet Union and the western Allies persisted for years. The western powers were alienated by the Soviet action in repudiating the Tsarist government's pledges and making peace with Germany, by Moscow's efforts to promote world revolution, and by the terror in Russia which resulted in the liquidation of the upper and middle classes. They undertook to isolate Russia from the rest of Europe by establishing a "cordon sanitaire" of anti-Soviet border states.

Placed on the defensive by the failure of the Communist-inspired world revolutionary movement and the quick recovery of the capitalist powers, Moscow made an alliance with Germany (the Rapallo Treaty of 1924) and lent its active support to the mass agitation for peace in the non-Soviet countries. Meanwhile the Soviet regime worked to consolidate its internal position, to train a large conscript army, and to lay the foundations for great industrial power. The rise of fascism and militarism in Germany,

⁵⁷ Cf. N. S. Timasheff, "Religion in Russia," *Current History*, VIII (February, 1945), pp. 105-110; and R. H. Markham, "Stalin and the Orthodox Church," *Christian Century*, LXII (April 18, 1945), pp. 490-492.

⁵⁸ N. S. Timasheff, "What Does This War Mean to Russia?", *Current History*, VIII (May, 1945), pp. 426-430.

Italy and Japan resulted in a shift in Soviet policy, designed to win the support of the democratic capitalist nations against the threat of fascism and militarism. The U.S.S.R. made a military alliance with France, in 1934, and entered the League of Nations. Isolated by the Munich Pact of September, 1938, Russia in August, 1939, concluded a non-aggression pact and territorial deal with Germany which opened the way for Hitler's attack upon Poland.

Wartime Gains. In return for Moscow's agreement to remain neutral, Germany agreed to give Russia the eastern half of Poland and to allow the Soviet government a free hand in Finland and the Baltic States. While Germany was fighting Britain and France, the Russians occupied eastern Poland, annexed the three small Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—and attacked Finland when the latter refused to accept Soviet control. Although expelled by the League of Nations for its attack upon Finland, Russia proceeded to crush Finnish resistance and extract territorial and strategic concessions. However, when Russia was attacked by Germany in 1941, Russia joined in the anti-fascist war with the western democracies through a treaty of alliance with Great Britain and agreements with the United States. In 1945 Russia also declared war upon Japan shortly before the Japanese surrender.

As a result of victory in World War II Russia regained most of the territory and spheres of influence lost in World War I and some additional territories. In the west it annexed eastern Poland, Bessarabia, Bukovina, Ruthenia, parts of Finland, and northern East Prussia including the port of Koenigsberg. In the east it annexed southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, occupied northern Korea, and obtained from China an agreement for a joint naval base at Port Arthur, a free port at Dairen and joint ownership and management of the South Manchurian and Chinese Eastern Railways. In addition to these territorial gains, the Kremlin brought all of eastern Europe, part of central Europe, and the Balkans, with the exception of Greece, into the Soviet sphere of influence. Red armies overran Finland, Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Austria and eastern Germany before the end of World War II. Consolidation of Russian influence in these areas is now being effected. By the Potsdam Declaration of August 3, 1945, Russia's claims to eastern Poland were tacitly confirmed. In compensation, Poland was

given former German territory east of the Oder River and including German Silesia, a territory rich in raw materials and industrial power. The Soviet-sponsored "Polish Provisional Government of National Unity" was recognized by the Allies and support withdrawn from the Polish government-in-exile. Allied control commissions were created for Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, and Romania but deference was given to Soviet influence in those states. Governments friendly to the U.S.S.R. were erected in all of the states of central and eastern Europe except Austria. Provisions were made at the conference to dictate peace treaties to these former satellites of Germany and then allow their entry into the United Nations. To secure for Russia an ice-free port, the German city of Königsberg, in East Prussia, and its adjacent areas was awarded to Russia by the conference. The remainder of East Prussia was ceded to Poland.

Security against a German war of revenge was provided for at Potsdam by a decision to extirpate German Nazism and militarism and to prevent Germany from ever again threatening the peace of the world by depriving her of her heavy industries and armaments factories. In the temporary partition of Germany into four zones of occupation, Russia was allotted approximately half of the territory of the Reich. With regard to reparations that were to be exacted from Germany, the U.S.S.R. was to control not only all of the industry of the eastern zone but 25 per cent of the heavy equipment of the western zones, 10 per cent of which was free and 15 per cent in exchange for foodstuffs and raw materials from the eastern zone.

Foreign Policy in the Postwar World. After the Yalta and Potsdam agreements, Soviet foreign policy aimed at consolidation of Russia's war gains in central and eastern Europe, domination of the Black Sea, the Straits, and the eastern Mediterranean, and expansion of Russian influence in the Near and Far East. Playing a delaying game in negotiations with the Allies, the Kremlin used the time thus gained to set up communistic regimes in the areas of central and eastern Europe occupied by troops of the Red Army. Pressure was brought to bear upon Iran and Turkey to open the way for penetration into those states. Blocked by United Nations opposition to her moves in Iran, Russia intensified her demands upon Turkey for joint control over the Dardanelles. Meanwhile, Soviet domination over Yugoslavia and

Albania permitted her to gain access to the Adriatic and thus threaten the British life-line to the East.

Meanwhile, Communist propaganda was utilized to stir up anti-British agitation in Egypt and the Arab countries in the attempt to drive the British from the Soviet pathway of expansion into the Middle East. Similar policies were pursued in the Far East through Moscow's support of the Chinese Communists and the anti-American campaign in Korea and Japan. The conflict, thus deployed over most of the world between Russia and her satellites and the Anglo-American bloc of nations, was slowly splitting the world into two opposing armed camps.⁵⁹

RECENT TRENDS

Domestic Difficulties of the U.S.S.R. The ambitious program of industrial expansion announced to the world by Moscow in the form of another Five-Year Plan at the close of World War II by early 1948 was falling far short of meeting the needs of the Russian people, let alone the external commitments of the government. Industrial output was only 77 per cent of the prewar level. Food production was not meeting real needs in terms of a comfortable standard of living as judged by Western standards. Transportation, long a bottleneck to Soviet industrial expansion, was carrying 25 per cent less than in 1940. Steel, the basic measure of industrial progress, was being produced at a rate of 75 per cent of the prewar volume. Cotton fabric, a significant factor in consumer goods production, was down to about 64 per cent of the comparatively low prewar level. A similar situation prevailed in regard to household equipment, shoes, and housing facilities.

⁵⁹ For a general treatment of foreign policies of the U.S.S.R., see A.L.P. Dennis, *The Foreign Policies of Soviet Russia* (New York: Dutton, 1924); N. Connolly, *Soviet Economic Policy in the East* (London: Oxford U.P., 1933); D. J. Dallin, *Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy, 1939-1942* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942); H. C. Wolfe, *Imperial Soviets* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1940); D. J. Dallin, *Russia and Postwar Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943); W. Mandel, *The Soviet Far East and Central Asia* (New York: Dial Press, 1944); and J. Joesten, *What Russia Wants* (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1944). For recent developments, see W. H. Chamberlin, "Some Truths About Poland," *American Mercury*, LX (February, 1945), pp. 204-212; C. E. Braun, "The Balkans After Yalta," *Current History*, VIII (May, 1945), pp. 421-425; and D. J. Dallin, "What Russia Wants in the Far East," *American Mercury*, LXI (July, 1945), pp. 26-34. See the articles in *World Report* on the foreign policies of the U.S.S.R. in 1946 (especially for June 6, August 22, and October 15, 1946); and the records of speeches in the Paris Peace Conference on the last pages of each issue.

Bottlenecks due to lack of machinery in the transportation, agricultural, and oil industries made progress slow and difficult.⁶⁰ Compared to total output in the United States, Russia was producing in 1948 on a level comparable with that of this country in 1902.

Recent revelations of tremendous inflation and extensive black markets in the Soviet Union have served to cast much doubt upon the myth of a planned economy in which these embarrassing phenomena of capitalistic societies were presumed to have been eliminated. In December, 1947, the Soviet Government announced a drastic devaluation of the currency and the termination of rationing. The purpose was to put an end to inflation and restore market prices to levels within the reach of the ordinary consumer. All old currency was called in and replaced by new currency of one-tenth its value. Owners of large bank accounts were faced with partial confiscation of their property. Fifty per cent of bank accounts of over 10,000 rubles and 30 per cent of those between 3,000 and 7,000 rubles were confiscated; those under 3,000 rubles were not touched. Investors in Soviet Government bonds saw them lose two-thirds of their value. This cut the debt burden of the Government by two-thirds, but also confiscated the savings of many workers who had been encouraged to invest their money in Government bonds.⁶¹

Meanwhile, heavy pressure was being put upon the workers to speed up production. Devaluation of the currency and abolition of rationing could not prevent inflation and black markets unless sufficient goods were produced to meet market demands, not to speak of promises made to satellite nations of the U.S.S.R. under the Molotov Plan. Hence, the whip was being cracked by (1) drastic criticism in the press of inefficient managers and workmen, (2) imposing of various forms of punishment for gross inefficiency or negligence of duty, (3) piecework wages, and (4) voluminous exhortation to workers to work harder. Whether these efforts could result in sufficient increase in production of goods to meet both the internal and external requirements of the Soviet Union only the future will show.⁶²

⁶⁰ "Soviets' Urgent Needs, Fuel, Food, Production," *World Report*, III: 25 (December 16, 1947), pp. 8-9.

⁶¹ "Moscow's Currency Deal," *World Report*, III: 26 (December 23, 1947), p. 13.

⁶² "Speed Up for Russia's Workers," *United States News and World Report*, XXIV:3 (January 16, 1948), pp. 26-27.

Consolidation of Soviet Power in Eastern Europe. Blocking off access to eastern Europe by means of the Iron Curtain and making use of her armies of occupation to enforce her purposes, the Soviet Union has been able since the war to consolidate her power and influence in this region to a degree warranting self-confidence in the future. All of the countries within the Soviet sphere of influence including Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Albania, and Eastern Germany have been forced to yield submission to the Soviet overlord and contribute booty in one form or another.

In particular, Austria, Hungary, and Eastern Germany have been forced to pay huge reparations. Russia's total take from the lands under occupation was estimated at nearly thirteen billion dollars, of which nine billion was removed from Germany alone. Since neither the German or Austrian peace treaties had yet been made, Moscow expected still further reparations gains and indeed insists upon them as a condition of peace.⁶³ Under Soviet auspices, cartels are being organized to exploit the industries and resources of the eastern European states.

Moreover, the U.S.S.R. had taken advantage of its military occupation of these states to force upon them Communist-dominated governments. By means of violence, chicanery and ruse, non-Communist parties were dissolved and their leaders imprisoned, executed, or driven into exile. Each of these states was bound to the Soviet Union and to each other by a network of trade treaties and military alliances. Under these treaties, the states involved have been forced by threats of reprisals to divert a large proportion of their trade to Russia in exchange for promises of Soviet-made goods which, because of the lag in Russian industry, are slow to appear. Czechoslovakia was able to escape complete absorption in the totalitarian flood until the 25th of February, 1946, when by a bloodless *coup* Russia gained complete control through the minority Communist party over a divided opposition. Though both Czechoslovakia and Poland were anxious to join the Marshall Plan, they were, by bribes, threats, and cajolery, prevented from doing so. In Romania and Hungary, joint stock companies supplied with Soviet capital have been created to expand shipping, banking, lumbering, and other

⁶³ For the conclusion of various Peace Treaties, see: "Peace Settlements of World War II," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLVII (May, 1948).

industries. The techniques being used to exploit these regions by Moscow are strikingly analogous to those formerly employed by the Nazis.

The U.S.S.R. in World Politics. On the wider plane of world politics, Soviet attempts in the cold war to win over Western Europe to the Communist bloc were defeated. Communist-inspired labor agitation and strikes in France, Italy, and Western Germany were put down and aroused an anti-radical reaction which culminated in January, 1948, in a policy statement by British Foreign Secretary Bevin calling upon the states of Western Europe to organize a western bloc against the Communist threat. Soviet opposition to consummation of the German Peace Treaty in the Conferences of Foreign Ministers held in March and November, 1947, compelled continued tremendous outlays of occupation costs to the United States and Great Britain and gave the U.S.S.R. more time in which to strip Eastern Germany of its capital, promote establishment of a Communist economy, and prevent reorganization of Germany on a national basis as a buffer to Soviet expansion in Eastern Europe.⁶³

In order to combat the Marshall Plan and to organize the Communist propaganda front in Europe more effectively, Soviet leaders promoted, in October, 1947, the organization of the Cominform, successor to the Comintern. Composed of representatives of the Communist Parties of the U.S.S.R., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, France, and Italy and having its headquarters in Belgrade, this new agency was preparing to defend Communist aims in Europe and spread its ideology over Asia and the world.⁶⁴

Meanwhile, Stalin's *coups d'état* in Poland, Hungary, Romania, Manchuria, and Korea, in violation of the Cairo and Yalta Agreements, were startlingly similar to Hitler's tactics prior to World War II. The great question was whether Stalin could practice greater restraint than Hitler. These steps were leading to hostility in Soviet-American relations and could precipitate another world war.

⁶³ "Building Up the Soviet Bloc," *United States News and World Report*, XXIV:5 (January 30, 1948), pp. 19-21.

⁶⁴ S. B. Fay, "The Cominform," *Current History*, XIV:77 (January 1948), pp. 1-5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BERGSON, A., *The Structure of Soviet Wages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1944). Very enlightening as to Soviet compensation methods.
- CARR, E. H., *Soviet Impact on the Western World* (New York: Macmillan, 1947). Brilliant and illuminating.
- CHAMBERLIN, W. H., *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Macmillan, 1935), 2 vols. An indispensable account of political conditions and events preceding, during, and immediately after the revolution.
- CRESSEY, G. B., *The Basis of Soviet Strength* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1945). Excellent on natural resources and natural conditions in Russia.
- DOBB, MAURICE, *Soviet Economy and the War* (London: Routledge, 1941). A brief but able exposition of Communist reconstruction under the Five-Year Plans up to 1940.
- DULLES, F. R., *The Road to Teheran* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944). A valuable commentary on Soviet-American relations.
- FLORINSKY, M. T., "Russia—The U.S.S.R.," in J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940). The most comprehensive treatment of Russian government up to 1940. Critical but fair.
- HAZARD, JOHN N., "The Soviet Government Organizes for Reconstruction," Chapter II, pp. 248–277, in David Fellman, ed., *Post-War Governments of Europe* (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publ. Co., 1946).
- JOHNSON, H., *Soviet Russia Since the War* (New York: Boni & Gaer, 1947). Valuable for up-to-date material.
- KARPOVITCH, M., *Imperial Russia, 1801–1917* (New York: Holt, 1932). A good brief history of this period.
- LAWTON, L., *An Economic History of Soviet Russia* (London: Macmillan, 1933), 2 vols. An excellent detailed account of economic developments in the early stages.
- LEHRMAN, H. A., *Russia's Europe* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1947). Russia's European Empire and its possibilities.
- LENIN, V. I., *State and Revolution* (New York: International Publishers, 1932). Much of Lenin's conception of Communism is to be found here.
- LYONS, E., *Stalin, Czar of All the Russias* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1940). Adversely critical of Stalin's policies, especially during the purges.

- PARES, B., *Russia and the Peace* (New York: Macmillan, 1944). Contains several good, brief chapters on Soviet problems. Treatment sympathetic. Emphasis on foreign relations.
- PRATT, H., *Russia: From Tsarist Empire to Socialism* (New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1937). Very handy for reference.
- SCHLESINGER, R., *Spirit of Postwar Russia* (New York: Dobson, 1947). Favorably considers Soviet postwar developments.
- SCHUMAN, F. L., *Soviet Politics at Home and Abroad* (New York: Knopf, 1946). Ably done. Pro-Russian in tendency.
- SCHWARTZ, H., *Russia's Post War Economy* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1947). Economic problems and future prospects.
- STALIN, J., *Marxism and the National Question* (New York: International Publishers, 1928). Speeches and reports of Stalin expressing his earlier views.
- The U.S.S.R. in Reconstruction* (New York: American-Russian Institute, 1944). A collection of very up-to-date articles by a number of writers. Propagandist in tone.
- VERNADSKY, G., *The Russian Revolution* (New York: Holt, 1932). Authoritative and well written. Handy for reference.
- WEBB, SIDNEY and BEATRICE, *Soviet Communism: A New Form of Civilization* (New York: Scribners, 1938), 2 vols. Comprehensive but somewhat biased in outlook in favor of the new system.
- YUGOW, A., *Russia's Economic Front for War and Peace* (New York: Harper, 1942). Good up-to-date analysis. Critical but fair.

ITALY

The Constitution of the new Italian Republic had not as yet emerged from the hands of the framers at this writing. Some idea of future constitutional developments could, however, be gained through consideration of the government of pre-fascist Italy and of the postwar line-up of the parties. The Italians followed the British model in the organization of the government under the Statuto (the prewar constitution). As in the case of the British system, the King appointed the Premier, who, along with his cabinet, was responsible to the lower house for his tenure of office. The appointive Senate was a feeble imitation of the British House of Lords. The Chamber of Deputies was chosen from single member districts like the British House of Commons.

In its practical operation, however, the political system failed to function in accordance with British practice. The King exercised more independent powers, and the Premier in many cases acted like a dictator. Large sections of the population were too ignorant to vote intelligently and were too often the dupes of designing politicians. The parties also tended to split into small groupings rather than to unite together into two or three major parties as in Great Britain. This in turn led to Coalition Cabinets too weak to check the Premier on the one hand and the Chamber of Deputies on the other. Hence, the Cabinet was unstable and weak, unable to take a decisive stand upon major issues like its British counterpart. Conflicts between Church and State and the existence of a Catholic Party in the political arena complicated the problem of Italian politics. If comparisons are made between the Italian and the American prewar political systems, few analogies emerge.

However, adoption of a republican form of government by the Italians in 1946 changed the picture somewhat. Dethronement of the House of Savoy and the putting of a President in the place of the King removed the great influence formerly exercised upon the Italian people and government by the Royal Family. In this

respect, the majority of Italians definitely repudiated the English example and indicated their desire for republican institutions. The question was what kind of republican institutions?

Italian political practice was apt to be influenced by the action of the French people in 1946 in adopting a constitution making the President dependent upon Parliament. With regard to the parliamentary set-up, the Communists in Italy, as in France, favored a single chamber while conservatives wanted a bicameral arrangement. All parties, however, were agreed upon the necessity for a system of independent courts similar to the court systems of Great Britain and the United States.

ITALIAN GEOPOLITICS

Upon Italy devolved the doubtful honor of having originated the Fascist movement. In the light of the nationalistic and imperialistic aims of Fascist ideology, Italy's decision to embark upon this dangerous and uncertain path seems difficult to explain in terms of the material basis of Italy's existence. With an area of 119,764 square miles and a population (in 1941) of over 45 millions, which was growing at the rate of over 400,000 annually, Italy undoubtedly was confronted with pressure of population on the available means of subsistence. The population density of 360 per square mile, considered from the standpoint of paucity of arable land and mineral resources could only mean, without industrialization, a gradually decreasing standard of living for the Italian people.¹

¹ Less than 30 per cent of Italy's available arable land (70,548,131 acres) is devoted to cereals and horticulture. Very little increase can be expected. While substantially self-sufficient in peacetime in foodstuffs, Italy's living standard compared to the other great powers is very low, amounting to only about one-half of that of Germany or Great Britain before the war. The principal item of food production is wheat (6,275,000 metric tons compared to 6,460,000 produced by France, in 1944). As regards other raw materials, the essentials of heavy industry, coal, iron, and petroleum, are almost entirely lacking. Other minerals, with the exception of mercury, sulphur and pyrites, bauxite, and zinc, are not to be found in Italy and even these exceptions are not in large quantity. Hence, Italy's industry, constituting only about 25 per cent of total production before the war, necessarily must be confined to light manufactures. Cf. Brooks Emeny, *The Strategy of Raw Materials in Peace and War* (New York: Macmillan, 1934), pp. 175-184; C. K. Leith, *World Minerals and World Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1931), Ch. III; J. F. Bogardus, *Europe* (New York: Harper, 1934), Ch. VI, and p. 656 ff. See also *Statistical Yearbook of the League of Nations*, for 1934.

Under the circumstances only two alternatives appeared feasible to Italy's imperialistic ruling class: (1) to export her surplus population to less densely populated lands, such as the United States, France, Argentina, and North Africa, and industrialize, relying as far as possible upon other countries for imports of essential materials; or (2) retain her surplus population, develop large military forces, adopt a system of economic autarchy, make favorable alliances, and endeavor to repair her material deficiencies by obtaining territory belonging to other nations. The former course, pursued in part by Italy up to World War I, meant peace and a reasonable degree of prosperity as a second rate power under British and French domination (because of their control of North Africa and the Mediterranean Sea). The latter alternative meant regimentation at home and almost certain war but the possibility (given time to achieve military superiority over her opponents) of gaining hegemony in the Mediterranean—in a word Fascism and a new Roman Empire.²

PRE-FASCIST ITALY

The Movement for Unification. For centuries, Italy existed as an ideal concept only. In reality, the peninsula was broken up into a congeries of small, independent states, frequently engaged in internecine strife, dominated by French, Spanish, and Austrian overlords, and separated into northern and southern portions by the Papal States of central Italy. After the Congress of Vienna (1815), the Italian peninsula was organized into nine major political entities, the most important of which were the Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia, Tuscany, the Kingdom of Naples, and the Papal States. A liberal national movement under Mazzini's leadership culminated, after a hard-fought struggle, in the granting by Charles Albert, King of Piedmont-Sardinia, in the revolutionary year, 1848, of a liberal constitution. Aided by the warlike abilities of Giuseppe Garibaldi, and the astuteness of his foreign minister, Cavour, Victor Emmanuel II, Charles's

² It is of course obvious that other alternatives were possible, such as reduction of the birth rate and ultimately the size of the population, or reeducation of the people to more productive pursuits; but these were not even given a thought by the ardent nationalists who were at the head of the Fascist movement. On this point see Carmen Haider, *Do We Want Fascism?* (New York: Day, 1934), pp. 74-82; and L. Villari, *Italy* (New York: Scribners, 1929), p. 126 ff., and Chs. XV and XVI.

successor, and head of the Royal House of Savoy, took the leadership in expelling Austrian forces from the peninsula, subordinating rulers of the other states to his control, and effectuating the political independence and unity of Italy. By 1861, Piedmont-Sardinia had established its sway over the rest of the peninsula, including the Papal States, and a Kingdom of Italy was proclaimed under the rulership of the House of Savoy. Elimination of dissident elements was completed by 1870 through acquisition of Venetia from Austria and expropriation of Rome from the Holy See. The "Statuto," of 1848, was made the Constitution of Italy and under the system of liberal parliamentary government provided for in this instrument, Italian leaders endeavored to solve Italy's difficult political and economic problems.³

Government Under the Statuto. Political unification was achieved when all of the states of Italy joined hands under the Constitution (Statuto) of the Kingdom of Piedmont; but racial, psychological, cultural, economic, and educational differences, particularly between the peoples of the north and south, still prevented attainment of that close national unity at which patriots aimed.

"The Statuto" in very general terms, provided for an hereditary monarch with broad nominal powers, an appointive Senate and an elected Chamber of Deputies. Existing judicial and local government systems were continued, subject to modification by law. Broad guarantees of individual rights were granted. A responsible ministry, appointed and dismissed by the King, was provided; but whether it was responsible to the King or to Parliament was not indicated. No provision for amendment was included. Hence, by usage, amendments were made by acts of Parliament.⁴

Under Cavour's enlightened leadership, the Italian Constitutional system was modeled by usage on those of Great Britain and France. In practice, the Cabinet became responsible to the Chamber of Deputies for the exercise of the King's powers, though the latter was not as devoid of political leadership as the English monarch. The Senate, appointed from 21 categories of high officials, property holders, and famous personages, assumed a definitely secondary role in legislation. Most of the other organs

³ For a detailed account of Italy's unification, see B. Bolton, *A History of Italian Unity, 1814-1871* (London: Nisbet, 1924), Vol. II.

⁴ A translation of the Statuto is to be found in H. L. McBain and L. Rogers, *The New Constitutions of Europe* (New York: Doubleday, Page, 1923), p. 551 ff.

of government conformed rather closely to French models. Voters for members of the Chamber of Deputies, severely restricted to property-holding males at first, later included all adult males. Both single and multiple district systems of representation were tried. Existence of several parties made coalition cabinets necessary; but, unlike France, the Chamber could be dissolved and illiterate voters pressured into electing government candidates. Hence, the Cabinet, especially under strong leaders, like Depretis, Crispi, and Giolitti, could easily dominate the Chamber. Relieved of responsibility to the voters through corrupt election practices, Deputies practiced "transformism," under which they aligned themselves with various leaders or groups according to the most advantageous bargain they could make.⁵

THE FASCIST REVOLUTION

The causes of the Fascist revolution remain obscure. Among them may be listed: (1) the existence in Italy of a strong nationalist clique, with representatives in high places, who aimed at an Imperial Italy, ruled by the upper classes; (2) Italian intervention in World War I on the side of the Allies against the will of the majority, and consequent financial and economic collapse after the war; (3) support of reactionary elements by war veterans, as a result of attacks upon them by radicals who were disappointed by Italy's failure to secure her territorial aims; (4) the rapid rise of socialism, especially after the introduction of proportional representation in 1919, resulting in the election of 150 Socialist deputies to the Chamber; (5) fears of the possessing and ruling classes of a Communist revolution, fears that were intensified when Socialist party and labor groups essayed to take over the factories and farms in various parts of Italy and run them as collective enterprises. Failure of the Socialist bid for power, due less to the ability of a weak government to handle the situation than to lack of "know-how" on the part of the Socialists themselves, resulted in the organization of fascist groups (*fasci di combattimento*), financed by large-scale industrialists and sup-

⁵ A. J. Zurcher, "The Government and Politics of Italy," in J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), pp. 582-583, 598-599.

ported by government officials and army officers, who made war on the Socialists and gradually broke up their organizations.⁶

As Salvemini shows, the Socialists had withdrawn from the factories and all danger of a Red revolution had subsided long before the March on Rome. Borgese alleges that chief responsibility lies with Mussolini, a renegade Socialist, who, expelled from the party in 1915, because of his stand for Italy's intervention in the war, assumed leadership in the organization of fascist groups during and immediately after the war, and was backed by the ruling business clique. Ambitious for power, Mussolini seized the historic moment, given reality by the general strike staged by the Socialist labor unions in August, 1922, to make himself a useful instrument of the ruling classes. Probably neither Mussolini nor those who supported his rise to power realized at the time how far towards absolutism he would go.⁷

Others place chief responsibility upon King Victor Emmanuel III. The March on Rome was not an armed revolt and could have been put down with ease by the armed forces. Plans for the March were known to the government. Premier Facta had declared a state of siege; but this the King refused to sign, meanwhile offering Mussolini a place in the Cabinet. Upon Mussolini's insistence, the King commissioned him to form a Cabinet, thus opening the way to power for the fascists. Hence, the March on Rome merely dramatized an event which had already taken place. The King's offer to Mussolini was probably entirely unnecessary. Danger of a radical revolution had passed, the country was recovering prosperity, and existing parties could have formed a liberal coalition capable of governing the nation without the aid of the fascists; but the King and the ruling interests he represented preferred fascism to a government dominated by Socialists and Christian Democrats and took this means of preventing such an eventuality.⁸

The Fascist Party. The taking over of the premiership by Mussolini found the Fascist Party in the early stages of its develop-

⁶ H. R. Spencer, *Government and Politics Abroad* (New York: H. Holt, 1936), pp. 294-309.

⁷ G. Salvemini, and G. La Piana, *What to Do with Italy* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1943), pp. 58-60; and G. A. Borgese, *Goliath: The March of Fascism* (New York: Viking, 1938), pp. 217-225.

⁸ H. L. Matthews, *The Fruits of Fascism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1943), p. 94. See also B. Mussolini, *My Autobiography* (New York: Scribners, 1938), Chs. VIII and IX.

ment. Organized as a socialistic faction in 1919 by Mussolini, it put forward candidates in the elections of that year, running on a radical platform, but with small success. In 1921, a national organization was formed at a convention held at Rome in November, and in the elections of that year, 35 fascists were elected to the Chamber. Local fascio were grouped together on a provincial level with a party secretary, directorate, and council, and on a national basis with a national secretary, directorate, and the Fascist Grand Council.

Early arrangements in the party were democratic to some degree; but in 1926, the Grand Council assumed complete control, and the principle of hierarchy was established with final authority vested in Il Duce, the party leader. Subsequent legislative enactments gave legal status to the party, and its leader, secretary, and Grand Council.⁹

Original members of the party were drawn mostly from the lower middle classes, war veterans, and turncoat Socialists, who sought safety in the new fascist groups. Limitations on membership were tightened until, in 1925, only graduates of fascist youth groups were admitted. Each year a new class joined the party with appropriate ceremonies.¹⁰

Novitiates took a solemn pledge of allegiance to the leader under party regulations enforceable by disciplinary measures of censure, suspension, or expulsion from the party. The Fasci, organized at first as a voluntary militia in the service of the State, later were made a part of the regular army with the particular function of preserving the regime.

Fascist Ideology. Fascism furnishes an interesting example of an ideology manufactured after the seizure of power in order to consolidate and hold it. Mussolini contends that the fundamentals of fascist doctrine were in being during the years of conflict (1919-1922).¹¹ The facts are, however, that the doctrine was a gradual development. Rejection by fascist leaders of the "Pact of Pacification" with the Socialists confirmed Mussolini in his alliance with the Nationalists, thus forcing him to become an advocate of imperialism, monarchism, and Catholicism. The

⁹ H. A. Steiner, *Government in Fascist Italy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938), pp. 35-41; and B. Mussolini, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-153.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 6.

¹¹ Benito Mussolini, *The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism*, tr. by Jane Soames (London: Hogarth Press, 1934), p. 10.

fascist lack of program, at first, was considered a positive advantage.¹²

Aided by Alfredo Rocco, Panunzio, and others, Mussolini worked out a program, drawing from the doctrines of Sorel, Hegel, Machiavelli, and Pareto the concepts that best suited his purposes. These concepts express the attitude of disillusionment with democratic and socialist optimism, lack of faith in the common man, desire for rule by strong leaders, and for national greatness. Antagonism of fascism to socialism was shown by its expressed hostility to pacifism and its glorification of war. Fascist distrust of international covenants stems logically from fascist apotheosis of the state as the supreme human association. Each state in this view, is a law unto itself, unbound by legal obligations of any sort.

The interpretation of fascist doctrine accepted by the author parallels the generally approved view that fascist ideology is a rationalization of the basic economic and political interests of the principal fascist leaders and the groups they represented, e.g. glorification of the state, repudiation of international covenants, and deliberate incitement to war represented a calculated pattern of ideas and also of conduct mapped out by the leaders of a "have not" state for the purpose of justifying forcible seizure of territory belonging to other states. However, this analysis, too narrowly construed, may overlook the fact that fascist doctrines were, are, and will continue to be rooted in the Italian culture pattern even after the institutions of fascism have been obliterated.¹³

Socialist materialism was rejected by fascist theory as false. Material welfare, it was held, was less significant than the spiritual unity of the whole, a feeling of group oneness tinged with romantic mysticism and a heroic desire to die for one's country. Hence, class warfare was ruled out as an intolerable disruption of the unity and efficiency of the State. Mussolini rejected democratic dogma as untenable in theory and a failure in practice. Rule of the majority he denounced as stupid and anarchical, since it made government depend upon the consent of individuals, and, because it is anarchical, apt to lead to reaction. The democratic principles of the greatest good for the greatest number, and of natural equality were stigmatized as inexpedient and untrue to fact. The good of the State as a whole, fascists insisted, is superior to the good of individuals and above even the sum of individual values, hence democracy, where each man

¹² H. L. Matthews, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-23, 85-88.

¹³ H. L. Matthews, "Fascists Die, But Fascism Still Lives," *New York Times Magazine*, May 27, 1945, p. 5 ff.

considers his own good first, cannot be a valid form of government. Representative and parliamentary government was viewed by fascists as inefficient and corrupt. Democracy, they contended, should be replaced by a system of authority, order, and discipline in which the best fitted for leadership, the élite of the nation, rule, and the rest of the people obediently follow. Democracy, fascists alleged, was the political counterpart of liberal capitalism and, now that economic liberalism has been outmoded, democracy, too, has become unfitted for modern, streamlined government.

Basic to fascist doctrine was the conception of the "organic" State, which is a positive directing force, as opposed to the "mechanistic" State of liberalism which, guided by compromise rather than rational design, moves about aimlessly. The fascist State was conceived of as an absolute of which both individuals and groups were only related parts. Since the State is an absolute moral and spiritual good, absolute force belongs to it as of right. It is the depository of national security, the transmitter of national traditions, and the highest living reality, educating, unifying, and harmonizing the citizens towards the goal of national oneness, thus providing the solution to the disintegrating tendency of class warfare expressed in the conflict of capitalism and socialism. To this sacred human association, individuals and groups owe loyalty and obedience. The concept of "duty" replaces that of "liberty." Individual rights must be subordinated to the good of the State as an organic whole, though reasonable rights still remain. For Mussolini, the State embodied the "immanent spirit of the Nation" and was a living expression of the will-to-power. Hence, it is more than mere organization; it is totalitarian, inclusive of all human relationships. In consequence, any associations in conflict with it must be eliminated.¹⁵

GOVERNMENT UNDER THE FASCISTS

The Executive. Aside from intimidating threats, Mussolini kept his pact with Victor Emmanuel and accepted the House of Savoy as the legitimate holder of monarchical powers in Italy. However, several important changes were made in the King's

¹⁵ For additional material on Fascist Ideology, see Mussolini, *loc. cit.*, and R. L. Buell, et al. *New Governments in Europe* (New York: Nelson, 1937), Ch 1.

status and functions. The Grand Council of the Fascist Party was given power to advise the government as to questions of succession to the throne; the Premier was made responsible to the King instead of to Parliament; and the King's choice of Mussolini's successor was limited to a list of names provided by the Grand Council. For their part, the King, Prince Humbert, and the Royal Family loyally supported the fascist regime.¹⁶

By the law of December 24, 1925, Il Duce was made Head of the Government with power to nominate all Ministers of State to the King, coordinate their activities, and preside over their deliberations in the Council of Ministers. Ministers were made responsible for their official acts to the King and the Head of the Government. The latter could take over one or more ministries himself, using under-secretaries to perform detailed duties of the offices. Heavy punishments were decreed for offenses against the Head of the Government by word or deed.¹⁷

Practically complete power over legislation was conferred upon Mussolini by this act. No bill could be presented in either chamber without his consent. Bills rejected by either House had to be reconsidered at his request after a three months' interval, or transferred to the other Chamber for consideration. In addition, Mussolini's power to issue and decree laws, already very extensive, was broadened to cover legislation facilitating execution of the laws and the organization of administration. In case of emergency, practically unlimited power to legislate by means of decree was conferred, subject only to the limitations that they be published and placed before Parliament speedily. If not rejected by the legislature, a very unlikely event, they terminated in two years.

The Grand Council. In addition to acting as the policy-making organ of the Fascist Party, the Grand Council became, by the law of December 9, 1928, as amended, a constituent and policy-making arm of the State, more potent in power and influence than Parliament itself, drawing the party and the government together in indissoluble unity. Under the law, as amended, the Head of the Government presided over the Council, summoned it, and determined its agenda. Its members included the Quad-

¹⁶ Cf. W. E. Rappard, et al., *Source Book on European Governments* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1937), pt. III, pp. 10-11; and G. Salvemini and G. La Piana, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹⁷ Rappard, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-13.

rumvirs, the Presidents of the two legislative chambers, the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Interior, Justice, Finance, National Education, Agriculture and Forests, and Corporations, the President of the Royal Academy of Italy, the Secretary and two Vice-Secretaries of the National Fascist Party, the head of the Fascist Militia, the President of the Special Tribunal for the Defense of the State, the Presidents of the National Fascist Confederations, and of the National Confederations of the Fascist Syndicates of Industry and Agriculture, and such other persons as Mussolini might designate. Its members could belong to Parliament and were given special immunity from arrest, and from discipline by the party. The Council's functions included the right to be consulted on all constitutional questions: *e.g.*, the monarchy, the executive and legislative branches, the corporative organization, relations with the Vatican, and treaties involving territorial changes; the right to draw up lists of candidates for the Chamber of Deputies; and to name a list of candidates to the King for succession to the position of Head of the Government. Long deemed a puppet agency accepting unquestioningly Il Duce's direction, the Grand Council proved strong enough in July, 1943, to bring about Mussolini's downfall.¹⁸

The Chamber of Deputies. After gaining power in 1922, Mussolini organized a coalition ministry including, in addition to representatives of the Fascist Party, two Liberals, two Popularists, and two Social Democrats. He demanded and obtained from Parliament full powers for his government until 1923. In 1923, under Fascist pressure, an electoral law was passed whereby the party receiving a plurality of votes, providing it equaled 25 per cent of the total vote cast at the election, would be given two-thirds of the seats in the Chamber, the remainder to be apportioned among the other parties in accordance with the size of their votes. Pressure by government agents on the voters resulted in a large vote for the Fascists who thereby gained control of two-thirds of the membership of the lower House.

Criticism of corrupt electoral methods of the Fascists by leaders of the opposition parties in the Chamber aroused Fascist resentment and led to the murder of the Socialist Deputy, Matteotti, for his outspoken remarks. Popular disapproval of this

¹⁸ For a translation of the law of December 9, 1928, as amended, see N. L. Hill and H. W. Stoke, *The Background of European Governments* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1940), pp. 495-498.

outrageous crime which, it was whispered, was ordered by Mussolini himself, caused the regime to totter on its foundations. The opposition parties foolishly left the Chamber and retired to Aventine Hill to await results. This enabled Mussolini to gain a free hand in Parliament. He boldly defied his opponents, accepted responsibility for all Fascist acts so far perpetrated, and proceeded to force through constitutional changes, which inaugurated the dictatorship. Opposition deputies who sought to resume their seats were refused admittance, and, later, all opposition parties were outlawed.

With all organized opposition removed, the Fascists proceeded to reorganize the Chamber of Deputies. Voters for deputies were required either to be dues-payers in a Fascist syndicate; pay 100 lire in direct taxes or hold 500 lire worth of bonds; be employed by the government; or be a member of the clergy. Deputies were to be chosen by the voters on a nation-wide basis from a list of 400 names selected by the Grand Council from a list of 1,000, 800 of which were proposed by the nine National Confederations of Employers and Employee Syndicates, and 200 from other associations of national significance. In the elections of 1929 and 1934, the deputies were chosen in this manner. Voters were required to give a simple affirmative or negative vote to the entire list. The affirmative ballot was in the national colors, the negative in plain white. Thus dissenters could be easily distinguished. The result was a practically unanimous vote for the lists.

Nevertheless, Mussolini was dissatisfied with the Chamber of Deputies, because he felt that it was an anachronistic reminder of the old type of parliamentarism and wanted to integrate his corporative system more completely with the governmental machine. Hence a committee of the Grand Council was appointed in 1936 to study the problem. Its proposal, as modified by Mussolini, was accepted on October 7, 1938, by the Grand Council, approved by the Chamber on December 19, and by the King on January 19, 1939, to the accompaniment of loud beating of the drums. The act was said to be the crowning achievement of the regime. Unlike the old Chamber, the new Chamber of Fasci and Corporations had a variable membership, ranging around 650. Under the new plan, the system of elected deputies was abolished and all members held their offices *ex-officio*. Included as members were Il Duce, the Grand Council (25), the

National Council of the Fascist Party (120), and the National Corporative Council (550). Some of the members held positions in more than one organization, hence the actual total was less.

Denominated National Councillors, members could be seated only by decree of Il Duce and approval by the President of the Chamber. Their right to a seat could be canceled by Mussolini at any time. Qualifications, privileges and immunities were similar to those enjoyed by the Deputies. They received an annual compensation determined by law. The new plan facilitated consideration of measures by providing for reference of bills dealing with constitutional, budgetary, and other important matters to the plenary session; and all other bills directly to committees of the Senate without waiting for action by the whole House. Government bills not passed by committees in 30 days could be enacted by decree. Fourteen committees, or commissions, were created with members appointed by the President of the Chamber, ranging in size from 25 to 40. Their presidents were appointed by royal decree. Advent of the war and overthrow of the regime prevented an adequate try-out of the new experiment. However, the increasing inactivity of Parliament during the 1930's did not augur well for its success.¹⁹

The Senate. Practically no changes were made in the Senate. This body was complacent towards fascism from the start and continued so throughout. Mussolini insisted that new appointees should be fascists and men over 60 years of age. He used the Senate as a sounding board for his speeches, which were frequently addressed to them.²⁰

The Judiciary. Consolidation of the Fascist regime brought numerous changes to the Italian judicial system. These included changes in the court system, changes in the status of judicial officials, and revision of the law codes.

Italian Courts—The Court of Cassation. The previously existing plan of five courts of cassation (supreme courts) was abolished and replaced by a single Court of Cassation. This body listened to appeals from lower courts on points of law and settled conflicts of jurisdiction and competence of lower courts.

Courts of Appeal. The district Courts of Appeal were main-

¹⁹ For further material on the Chamber of Fasci and Corporations, see H. A. Steiner, "Fascist Italy's New Legislative System," *American Political Review*, XXXIII (June, 1939), pp. 456-465; and Hill and Stoke, *op. cit.*, pp. 491-495.

²⁰ Cf. Villari, *op. cit.*, p. 179, and Zurcher, *op. cit.*, p. 639-640.

tained in 34 districts. These courts were usually divided into sections which dealt with civil, criminal, and labor cases. The section on labor cases gave final decisions on breaches of labor contracts.

Assize Courts. These courts handled criminal cases involving penal offenses. The jury system formerly employed was abolished by the fascists who set up instead a body consisting of a presiding and associate judge from the Court of Appeal and five laymen who acted as co-judges. Prosecutions were handled by special deputies designated by the Attorney General of the Court of Appeal.

Courts of First Instance. Composed of three judges, these courts dealt with less serious criminal cases and with civil cases involving more than ten thousand lire.

Magistrates Courts—The Tribunals. These were local courts, located in larger cities, having jurisdiction over civil, criminal, and labor cases of limited importance.

Justice of the Peace Courts. Petty civil and criminal issues were handled by these courts of which some 1,300 were distributed throughout the country.

Conciliation Courts. More than 7,500 of these agencies existed under fascism to settle minor civil disputes. Appeals were taken to the Magistrates Courts.

Administrative Courts. Special courts to adjust cases involving public officials and government business continued to function. Chief of these was the *Court of Accounts* which dealt with claims against the government.

The Special Tribunal for the Defense of the State. This agency was created in 1926 to deal with cases involving political offenses against the State. Presided over by high-ranking army and militia officers, its procedure was that of a summary court-martial.

The Status of Judicial Officials. Independence of judges, guaranteed in prewar Italy by life-time tenure and special provisions to protect them against removal, transfer, demotion, or loss of salary, was destroyed by placing them under provisions of legislation to "cleanse" the civil service, thus enabling the government to remove judges considered anti-fascist in tendency. In addition, by conferring special powers upon the police to (1) "admonish" persons suspected of anti-fascist views; (2) deport undesirable citizens; or (3) send them to concentration camps, the government was able to evade court action to protect the

rights of citizens, including court officials themselves. Finally, judges whose actions were considered definitely seditious might be tried by the Special Tribunal for the Defense of the State. Nevertheless, some judges maintained an attitude of detachment in spite of fascist measures against them.²¹

Revision of the Law Codes. Civil and criminal codes of law were substantially revised by the fascists to embody their particular views. The jury system was abolished—thus removing this traditional means of protection for the citizen against the government. Stricter inquisitorial procedure was instituted, the death penalty was reestablished, and the right of citizens to sue public officials for wrongful acts was canceled. Administrative courts were prevented from making decisions adverse to government officials by placing party men on every provincial Junta, abolishing the section of the Council of State dealing with suits by citizens against illegal acts of officials, and locating that body in the office of the Head of the Government. New “political” crimes were defined by the codes, and legislation was enacted discriminating in favor of fascists and against non-fascists. Examples of this include (1) giving preference in employment to fascists over non-fascists; (2) cancellation of citizenship of persons of foreign birth who had acted in opposition to the regime; (3) revocation of citizenship and confiscation of property of Italian dissidents abroad. Criminal legislation directed against political offenders was enacted extending from “admonitions” by the police to deportation or incarceration in concentration camps. Such persons were tried before the Special Tribunal for the Defense of the State. The organization and procedure of this Court weighted all decisions against accused persons. The judges were selected from among officers of the army and militia by Mussolini himself. The procedure was obviously unfair. No bail was allowed the accused. Defense attorneys could be removed by the Court and its own appointee substituted. No defense could be made until after the preliminary examination, and no appeals were allowed from judgments of the Court. Court costs were excessively high. Trials by newspaper and acts of violence by fascists against accused persons were common.²²

Fascist Local Government. Local government in Italy which,

²¹ Zurcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 644–648, 702 ff.

²² W. Ebenstein, *Fascist Italy* (New York: American Book, 1939), Ch. III; Zurcher, *loc. cit.*; and Villari, *op. cit.*, pp. 220–233.

prior to the war, conformed rather closely to the French design, was subjected to changes intended to centralize control in the national government and deprive the people of the localities of a voice in local affairs. Departments were grouped into compartments, which followed territorial boundaries of previously independent states. These areas were used for administrative and statistical purposes. Seventeen new provinces were organized. Departmental prefects were given greater powers subject to the Ministers of Interior and Finance. All political activities within the province were brought within his authority except justice, aeronautics, military, and maritime affairs. Repression of popular uprisings and censorship of the press were especially committed to his charge. The formerly elective provincial council was replaced by an appointive council with purely advisory functions. Subprefectures were abolished.

The Communes, formerly governed by a Sindaco chosen by the popularly elected Communal Council, were subordinated to a Podestá who governed with the aid of an appointive council with nominal powers. Both prefects and podestás were appointed by the Minister of the Interior and were subject to his supervision, extending ultimately to removal from office.

Private Rights Under Fascism. The laws against dissident exiles and naturalized citizens have already been mentioned, as has also the law to purge the civil service, and to curb commission of political offenses against the state. All persons were required to have cards of identification, and police permits were asked for emigrants who could be punished for attempting to leave the country for political reasons. All associations were expected to furnish the police with complete information regarding their officers, rules, members, etc., and could be dissolved by the prefect for failure to do so. Civil servants were compelled to reveal their associational connections. Judges, government officials, professors, teachers, and employees of the departments of Foreign Affairs, Interior, and Colonies were forbidden to belong to professional associations. Students were prohibited from forming student associations. Political parties were outlawed and could not be reorganized under threat of heavy penalties. Dissemination of party propaganda was also made a crime. Similar taboos were applied against secret associations, and those of an international character.²³

²³ Buell, et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 90-94.

The Corporative System. Fascist ideology loudly proclaimed the organization of the corporative state as a means of solving the perennial conflict of capital and labor, organizing production as a unified whole under state supervision, maintaining the productive features of private enterprise, and making production and work a matter of national concern to the state, and a social duty to employers and employees, while at the same time the rights of labor were preserved. Actually the economic organization carried through by Mussolini and his cohorts achieved economic peace by destroying the independent labor organizations and the right of the workers to have a voice in determining the conditions under which they labored. Far from representing application of the syndicalist or guild socialist idea of operation of industry by the workers, the scheme put into effect by the fascists was based upon the reactionary doctrines of the Nationalists and Papacy embodied in their platforms before the March on Rome.²⁴

Establishment of the syndicates was made possible through Mussolini's pact with Edmondo Rossoni, a renegade labor unionist, who was persuaded to organize fascist unions. Stemming from a National Congress held at Bologna, in 1922, and backed by the power of the dictatorship after the March on Rome, the fascist confederation grew prodigiously. In the meantime, the independent socialist and Catholic unions were attacked by armed squadristi, their offices and newspapers sacked and suppressed, and their leaders imprisoned, deported, or exiled. Big employers backed the movement for the most part. The few remaining intransigents were bullied into submission.²⁵

Workers syndicates, established by law in 1926, were based upon Rossoni's fascist labor organizations. In order to make the system work, it was provided that a workers syndicate needed, for recognition, only 10 per cent of the workers of a given category in a given area. Dues-paying members were given preference in employment. Thus while independent unions were not legally suppressed, in practice, they were driven out of existence. Factory committees of the unions were made illegal and their functions transferred to the syndicates. In theory, syndicate officers were chosen by their members but, in practice, the slate of officers for each syndicate was forced upon them by fascist leaders and

²⁴ H. Finer, *Mussolini's Italy* (New York: H. Holt, 1935), pp. 492-495.

²⁵ Cf. H. L. Matthews, *op. cit.*, p. 165, and H. Finer, *op. cit.*, pp. 495-497.

chosen by acclamation. No one could hold office unless acceptable to the government.²⁶

Local workers' and employers' syndicates were grouped into provincial and national federations. There were no mixed groups. National Federations were combined into nine Confederations (combinations of several categories). Local organizations were subjected to supervision by prefects and national unions by the Ministry of Corporations. Later, local syndicates were deprived entirely of their legal right of self-government.²⁷

The Labor Charter. Enacted in 1927, the Labor Charter embodied the syndicalist organization, recognized private production as fundamental with government intervention only when necessary, provided for collective labor contracts between employees and labor syndicates, made strikes and lockouts illegal, and established labor sections of the Courts of Appeal to adjudicate conflicts over labor contracts.

The Corporations. The ideal of unity of purpose in production was not achieved by establishment of two parallel groupings of employer and employee associations, even though they were under government supervision. Obviously, integration could be achieved only when these conflicting interest-groupings were fused together on some level of action. After considerable hesitation, a start in this direction was made by reorganization in 1931 of the National Corporations with Mussolini as president and some 160 members, chosen mostly from the syndicates but with representation also from the Cabinet and the Party. Designed as a coordinative and consultative body, it was little used by the government. The Ministry of Corporations, with Mussolini at its head, continued to have much more to say on economic questions.²⁸ A Central Corporative Committee made up of about 20 of the principal members were authorized to act for the council while not in session. Seven sections were created in the council to deal with important aspects of production and came to be called "corporations."

Deepening of the depression in the early 1930's led to creation of emergency agencies to deal with various problems of finance and production. Gradually state control was extended over most

²⁶ Salvemini, *Under the Axe of Fascism* (New York: Viking Press, 1936), Chs. V, VI.

²⁷ Zurcher, *op. cit.*, p. 678.

²⁸ R. L. Buell, et al., *op. cit.*, pp. 118-119.

of industry. Wages continued to decline. Mussolini chose this seemingly propitious moment to institute the new corporative organization. In 1934, legislation gave the dictator power to establish corporations by decree. As a result, a new superstructure was provided with 22 corporations having jurisdiction over various categories of production, extending through all phases from raw materials to completed products. Each corporation was provided with a council representing employer and employee syndicates within its jurisdiction but containing representatives of the Party as well. Together, these councils constituted the National Council of Corporations comprising a total of more than 800 members. A refurbished Central Corporative Committee of about 45 members acted for the National Council in executive matters.

The fanfare accompanying this new creation, for which Mussolini claimed the character of a new revolution, in effect overthrowing the capitalistic system and setting up a government-controlled and unified productive system which would permit Italy to practice autarchy and yet provide comfort for her working classes, proved to be exaggerated. The functions of the corporations of giving advice on production matters and conciliating labor disputes were hardly revolutionary in scope and, in practice, every act of each corporation was purely advisory, subject always to approval by representatives of the Party and of the government on the councils, in the Ministry of Corporations, and by Mussolini himself.²⁹

Results of the Corporative System. The principal consequences of establishment of the Corporative State include the following: (1) The stifling of independent labor organizations and subjection of labor in Italy to domination by government and employers. (2) A free hand for employers to exploit labor (subject to doubtful governmental restraints) and enrich themselves at labor's expense. (3) Gradual extension of government control of industry and of state-owned industrial plants. (4) Growth of a top-heavy government bureaucracy which interfered with management, tended to stifle initiative, and enrich itself through graft. (5) Instead of expansion of production, a creeping paralysis set in which caused both output of goods and wages to decline with consequent bad effects on people and country. (6) The

²⁹ Cf. Salvemini, *op. cit.*, Ch. XV; Finer, *op. cit.*, p. 513 ff.; Zurcher, *op. cit.*, p. 690 ff.

Labor Courts to which much credit was given in earlier stages for liberality to the workers, proved unable to prevent continuing reductions of wages, as against increasing inflation of other prices, which ultimately reduced the workers of Italy to a condition of pauperism.³⁰

Armed Forces. Great emphasis was placed on military training by the Fascist regime. Male children at the age of 6 joined the Wolf Cubs where they were trained to march, use weapons, protect themselves against gas, and engage in camp life. At 8 years, they joined the Balilla where until they were 18, they were given intensive military training. When they reached the age of 21 they were drafted into the army for 18 months of training. After their release, they were given periodical training in the reserves until the age of 55.

The Army. In 1937, Mussolini claimed that Italy could mobilize 8,000,000 men. These were estimated to include 450,000 in the standing army, 900,000 in the active reserves, and 5,600,000 in the inactive reserves. The balance would be made up of youths from 18 to 21.

The Air Force. Estimated at 36,000 pilots and 1,500-2,500 first-line planes in 1937, a goal of 4,000 first-line planes was aimed at by 1941.

The Navy. Built up rapidly after the London Naval Conference of 1927, the Italian fleet was considered almost the equal of the French by 1939. Chief emphasis was placed on submarines and light surface units. The three military arms, army, navy, and air force, were organized under entirely separate ministries.³¹

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Throughout the period of the fascist regime, Mussolini's settled policy was to create a "New Roman Empire" which would exercise hegemony in the lands washed by the Mediterranean Sea (*Mare Nostrum*). To this end, Il Duce spent the decade of the twenties in building the nation internally into a totalitarian state and attempting to regiment the Italian people into habits

³⁰ Salvemini, *op. cit.*, Chs. 3-14, and Zurcher, *op. cit.*, p. 696 ff.

³¹ Cf. C. L. Heyman, "Arms Over Europe," *Current History*, XXXVI (September, 1937), pp. 49-56, and Liddell Hart, "The Armies of Europe," *Foreign Affairs*, XV (January, 1937), pp. 235-253.

of discipline and obedience, rendering them inured to hardship and ready for military ventures. The failure of the Corporative State to solve Italy's problems during the depression and Mussolini's desire to distract the attention of the people from their internal troubles confirmed him in his aim to orient Italy towards a policy of deliberate imperialism with the purpose of victimizing the weaker peoples of the Mediterranean area for Italy's aggrandizement. The attempt of the League of Nations to prevent his seizure of Ethiopia in 1935, led Mussolini to make common cause with Hitler. Formation of the Rome-Berlin Axis and intervention in Spain and Albania by Italy was the result. An anti-Jewish policy was adopted by Mussolini to please Hitler, and applied in Italy over public opposition. Fear of war for which Italy, exhausted by her imperial ventures, was unprepared, caused the people to hate Germany and doubt Mussolini. Il Duce, confident of a quick victory by Germany over the democracies, and wishing to share in the spoils, entered into a war alliance with Hitler in May, 1939, and joined the Anti-Comintern Pact. He hoped to avoid war but still profit by an Axis victory, meanwhile protecting Italy against contingencies by negotiating a non-aggression pact and a commercial treaty with Russia, and fortifying the Brenner Pass.

The joy of the people when Hitler released Italy from its pledge to join him in war against the Allies in the fall of 1939 was changed to disillusionment when it was revealed that the principal reasons for Italy's not entering the war were fascist lack of preparedness and fear of French military prowess.³² Mussolini's timidity, not even overcome by German successes in Poland and Norway, inhibited action until Hitler's blitzkrieg crushed the French army, and Pétain sued for peace. Then Il Duce declared war and the people cynically supported this unscrupulous stab-in-the-back of France.³³ That Hitler, too, believed in a *quid pro quo* was shown when Italy's bid for part of the spoils was brutally rebuffed.

Persuaded that England would now surrender, Mussolini embarked upon his ill-fated ventures in Greece and North Africa,

³² W. Ebenstein, "The Impact of the Second World War in Italian Fascism," in H. Zink and T. Cole, *Government in Wartime Europe* (New York: Reynal and Hitchcock, 1941), pp. 146-150.

³³ H. L. Matthews, "A New Chapter in Eternal Rome," *New York Times Magazine*, (June 18, 1944), p. 8 ff.

hoping thereby to establish unchallenged Italian control of the Mediterranean before Hitler's hands were freed to move southward. Stunning defeats of fascist warriors by the Greeks and British in these campaigns demonstrated the pitiable state of inefficiency and weakness of the regime. Intervention of Germany in the Balkans in support of Italy paved the way for the taking over by Hitler of Mussolini's domain. Military policy justified Hitler in sending aid in the form of planes to cope with the British navy and troops to stiffen buckling Italian lines in Libya. Gradually all of Italy was brought under Nazi domination. Instead of blaming the army, as the people of Germany did, Italians vented their spite on the Fascist Party. Mussolini's shakeup of the Cabinet and the high command of the army had little effect.³⁴

Inflation of prices and scarcity of foodstuffs and raw materials increased popular bitterness against the regime. As a countermeasure, the fascists, backed now by the vicious methods of the Gestapo, revived their campaign of squadristi terrorism, selecting as particular victims the Jews, foreigners, and other dissidents.³⁵ As the tide of battle began to turn against the Axis because of Hitler's failure to overwhelm Russia, or take Egypt, popular pressure on the fascist regime was intensified. Military defeats and scarce rations led to strikes and labor sabotage. In August, 1942, Mussolini conducted a wholesale purge of the Party, ousting more than 100,000 members.³⁶

MUSSOLINI'S FALL

Allied landings in French North Africa in November, 1942, and the subsequent invasion of Sicily, paved the way for the fall of Mussolini. He was confronted with the complete bankruptcy of his policies, the opposition of the bulk of the people, and by Hitler's humiliating demand that the German High Command be placed in control of the Italian army. Faced with the vengeance of the victorious Allies, Il Duce could see no way out except retirement, yet he was reluctant to go. With the Allies intent upon driving up the boot of Italy, Mussolini's continued tenure of office by July, 1943, had become a definite embarrassment to

³⁴ Ebenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-160.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 164-170.

³⁶ R. G. Massock, *Italy From Within* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), p. 288 ff.

high leaders of the Fascist Party and to the King. Led by Dino Grandi, President of the Chamber of Fasci and Corporations, the party conspirators persuaded Mussolini to call a meeting of the Grand Council on July 24. They then proposed passage by the Council of a resolution requesting that control over military forces and executive authority be restored to the King.

On passage of the resolution by vote of 19 to 7, over Mussolini's violent objections, Grandi communicated the result to the King through Duke Filippo Acquarone, Minister of the Royal Household. Next day, the King received Mussolini and deposed him, appointing Marshal Pietro Badoglio in his stead as Prime Minister. As Mussolini left the royal palace, he was arrested by armed guards and imprisoned to prevent civil war.³⁷

PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT UNDER THE ALLIES

The Badoglio Government. On July 26, 1943, Badoglio formed a Cabinet composed largely of military officers and fascist officials and sympathizers. Anxious to remove the stigmata of fascism, the new leader began hastily to remove external manifestations of the fascist regime, establishing in its place nation-wide martial law and censorship to prevent further popular uprisings. Tearing down of fascist structures proceeded expeditiously. The National Secretary of the Fascist Party was removed from the Cabinet and the Party itself was ordered dissolved. The fascist militia was incorporated into the army thus bringing it under control of the King and Badoglio. The Chamber of Fasci and Corporations, the Grand Council, and the Special Tribunal for the Defense of the State were abolished. The "Corporative State" and all of its agencies were dissolved and preparations were made to re-establish the National Labor Confederation. Provisions of the civil and penal code discriminating against anti-fascists were ordered changed and some moves were made to purge fascist officials on the higher levels.

The Armistice. Though committed to continuation of the war by his promise to Hitler, Badoglio began secret negotiations

³⁷ For details of this very interesting event, see Mario Rossi's three articles on "Fascism Without Mussolini," *Nation*, CLX:19, 20, and 22 (May 12, 19, and June 2, 1945), pp. 539-544, 569-572, and 624-625; Dino Grandi, "Dino Grandi Explains," *Life*, XVIII (Feb. 26, 1945), pp. 21-23; and F. C. Painton, "How Mussolini Fell," *Harpers*, CXC:1136 (January, 1945), pp. 137-144.

with the Allies for a surrender. The problem was how to turn Italy over to the Allies in view of the presence of German forces in the peninsula. Badoglio's attempts to bargain plus his fear of Nazi interference caused delays. Finally his hands were forced by General Dwight D. Eisenhower's threat to make a unilateral declaration and, on September 3, the armistice was signed in Sicily. Meanwhile the King and Badoglio fled to Palermo, Sicily, thus abandoning the Italian army which after some resistance yielded to the German forces. Under these circumstances, it became necessary for the Allies to reconquer all of Italy, though most of the fleet escaped from the Germans.

Instruments of Allied Control Over Italy. Unconditional surrender placed Italy's fortunes completely under Allied control. The problem involved two major considerations: (1) the organs of control to be created; and (2) the extent to which Italians were to be permitted to rule themselves. Basic to the entire question of control were the provisions of the Armistice. Embodied in a "short" armistice made on September 3, 1943, were the strictly military conditions of surrender. This was published, but the "long" armistice of September 29, dealing with political and economic demands upon Italy, was kept a secret for more than three years. This was a constant source of irritation to the Italian people. Under terms of the "short" armistice, an Allied Military Mission was created to advise the Badoglio Government and supervise its affairs.

The Allied Military Government. The Allied Military Government (AMG), organized long in advance of its need, took control over territory as it was liberated by Allied troops. Operating under international law as derived from the Hague Conventions and the laws and usages of the occupying powers, the AMG had the following objectives: (1) to take over civil administration of areas liberated by the invading armies; (2) to restore law and order and the normal functions of civil life as rapidly as possible; (3) to mobilize economic resources of the occupied areas for war purposes; and (4) to advance Allied political and military purposes among the people of the defeated nation.

Organization of the AMG. Subordinated to the control of the Allied Military Commander in Italy and his deputy, the Chief Civil Affairs Officer, the AMG was a unit of the Allied Military Command. Staffed largely by army officers, it was organized into divisions dealing with appropriate governmental functions.

Results Under the AMG. The AMG, it is now admitted, made many blunders in its administration of Italian affairs. Directed to be neutral in politics but to eradicate fascism, the organization failed to do either. Italian liberals objected to AMG's "soft" policy towards purge of known fascists and its use of many fascists as administrators and police officials. The organization's lack of neutrality was seen also in earlier policies of discouraging liberal parties and movements and in its support of the conservative Badoglio regime. The AMG's work in bringing about rapid physical restoration of devastated areas was admittedly good, but its lack of ability to increase food supplies and control black markets caused popular resentment. Severe criticism led General Eisenhower, in November, 1943, to restrict the AMG's sphere of operations.³⁸

The Allied Control Commission. Following the Moscow Conference in November, 1943, General Eisenhower created the Allied Control Commission (ACC) for Italy to supervise execution of terms of the Armistice and align Italian economy on the side of the Allies in war against Germany. This body replaced the previously established Military Control Commission headed by British General Mason McFarlane. In January, 1944, ACC was reorganized and its general staff merged with the general staff of AMG but the separate identities of the two bodies were maintained. The word control was dropped from the title of the Commission and it was designated simply AC. By the spring of 1946, most of the provinces of Italy had been transferred by AC to Italian hands.

Organization of the AC. Personnel of the AC was half American and half British. The President of the Commission was the Supreme Allied Commander of the Mediterranean Theatre but the actual head was the Chief Commissioner. The Commission was divided into four major sections: (1) political, (2) economic, (3) administrative, and (4) regional control and military government. Each section was headed by a vice-president and was further divided into subsections dealing with various technical aspects of administration. Civilian experts tended to replace the original entirely military personnel.

Criticism of the AC. Mistakes made by the AC were often the result of misunderstandings by members of the Commission of

³⁸ C. Grove Haines, "Italy's Struggle for Recovery," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XX (December 1, 1944), pp. 228-230.

the Italian people and their circumstances. The organization was topheavy and unwieldy, and overlapping jurisdiction of its various branches caused delay and confusion. Some difficulties arose through staffing of different agencies by British and American personnel.

The Allied Advisory Council. Composed of American, British, Russian, French, Yugoslav, and Greek delegates, this Council exercised general supervision over civil affairs and determined Allied policies for Italy.³⁹

End of the Badoglio Government. Recognition of King Victor Emmanuel III and the Badoglio Cabinet by the Allies in October, 1943, immediately raised fundamental political issues. It seemed to place the stamp of Allied approval upon a regime which was tarred with the brush of fascism, a move hardly compatible with their declared intention of eradicating fascism in Italy. It also seemed to commit the Allies to upholding the monarchy, and brought them into conflict with anti-fascist underground groups now emerging into the open. On the other hand, the status of co-belligerent conferred upon the Italian government, coupled with detailed supervision of the provisional regime, placed Italian leadership in a weak and uncertain position. Broad objectives declared by the Allies towards Italy were: (1) to manage Italian affairs in such a way as to obtain maximum utilization of Italian resources for the conduct of the war; (2) to eradicate fascism; (3) to provide every opportunity for the Italian people to set up democratic institutions; and (4) gradually to reduce Allied tutelage and increase the authority of the Italian government.

However, the conceptions of democracy held by British and American authorities proved to be radically in conflict with those of the post-war liberation groups in Italy. British ideas of democratic institutions involved restoration of the Monarchy and support of capitalistic enterprises. To liberation groups on the other hand, the House of Savoy was anathema, while Socialists and Communists viewed large-scale business as an adjunct of fascism and aimed at a socialized state.⁴⁰ The question was whether the Allies were intending to support a continuation of fascism under an-

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 227-231.

⁴⁰ Cf. Angelo Crespi, "Italy Works Her Passage," *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII (June, 1945), pp. 339-344; and H. Eulau, "Britain and the Italian Left," *New Republic*, CXII (Jan. 22, 1945), pp. 109-111.

other name or whether the situation called for a housecleaning under an entirely new leadership. After occupation of Southern Italy by the Allies, leaders of opposition parties were finally allowed to come out of hiding and hold a convention at Bari, on January 25, 1944. There they demanded abdication of the King, resignation of Badoglio, and establishment of a coalition government until plans could be made to call a Constituent Assembly. Abdication of the King was opposed by Allied leaders, however, as an unsettling factor, until the Germans could be driven out of Italy. However, on April 12, the King announced that he would retire in favor of his son, Crown Prince Humbert, when Rome was taken by the Allies.

To meet the objections of opposition parties, Badoglio resigned but was reappointed with instructions to form a coalition cabinet. The new ministry, formed on April 21, contained representatives of each of the new parties, including 2 Independents, 2 Christian Democrats, 2 Liberals, 2 Socialists, 2 Actionists, 2 Communists, and 1 Labor Democrat. However 4 representatives of the old fascist cabinet were retained, including Badoglio. The King, on June 4, 1944, appointed Humbert as Lieutenant General of the Realm, in his stead. Badoglio thereupon resigned, and was succeeded by Ivanoe Bonomi, a pre-fascist liberal leader put forward by the coalition. Suspicion still attached to Prince Humbert because of his fascist associations.⁴¹

THE BONOMI COALITION CABINET

The coalition government under Bonomi worked under handicaps from the start. Limitations on its actions by the unpublished armistice provisions and unwillingness of the British-American Allies to forgive Italy's participation in the war as a member of the Axis and accept her as a full partner in the war against Germany prevented the Cabinet from taking adequate measures for relief of Italy's internal problems. The fact that AC and AMG exercised constant supervision and surveillance over it still further prevented the new government from acting with the independence required in the situation. Lack of a consulta-

⁴¹ Cf. L. Venturi, "Italy After Fascism," *Current History*, V (September, 1943), pp. 56-60; and Hilda Fisher, "Italy—Catspaw of the Allies," *Current History*, VII (July, 1944), pp. 31-35.

tive assembly to advise the Cabinet also detracted from its effectiveness. The result was divided responsibility, absence of vigor and drive in the country's leaders, and the perpetuation of many unsolved problems.

Preoccupation of the Allies with the campaign in Northern Italy prevented them from devoting adequate attention to Italy's festering sores. In spite of the work of AMG in eliminating fascist elements, they still occupied positions of influence both in and outside the government and carried on under-cover activities which grew bolder and more effective as time went on. Food shortages and black markets flourished. Unemployment was widespread and chronic. Corruption and graft in government, coupled with incompetency and political dissension, produced growing disillusionment among the people generally. Rising resentment against the Allies and a dangerous trend to the Left led the British-American Allies gradually to relax their controls over Italian affairs, to take steps to increase production of goods in Italy, and to import larger supplies of foodstuffs.⁴²

Political dissension split the Bonomi Cabinet, chiefly over the question of the retention of the Monarchy and the form of government to be adopted when peace was finally restored. Prince Humbert's statement, November 1, 1944, advocating retention of the Monarchy forced the parties to take a stand on the "institutional question."⁴³ Communist, Socialist, and Action parties, advocating a republic, moved into opposition while the Christian Democrats took their stand in support of the Monarchy. By majority vote, the Cabinet refused to accept Humbert's proposal to submit the question to a plebiscite and declared instead for a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution. Holding the balance of power in the crises, the Communists demanded intensification of the purge, lessening of Allied controls, strengthening of the powers of local committees of liberation, and appointment of Count Carlo Sforza as Premier in Bonomi's place. The Christian Democrats, on the other hand, called for an end to lawlessness and fifth column activities and urged retention of Bonomi as Premier.

⁴² Cf. "Italy: Test of Allied Statesmanship," *Scholastic*, XLV (October 16, 1944), pp. 3-4; and C. Poletti, "Scrubbing up after the Dictators," *American Magazine*, CXXXVIII (November, 1944), p. 17.

⁴³ H. L. Matthews, "Italian Monarchy Must Move Left, Crown Prince Humbert Declares," *New York Times* (November 1, 1944).

Bonomi's Second Cabinet, December, 1944-June, 1945. Because of continued friction in the Cabinet, Bonomi resigned. British opposition to Sforza as Premier opened the way for Bonomi to return to power, but the Socialist and Action parties refused to take seats in the reconstituted Cabinet under his leadership. Hence, the new Cabinet was made up of representatives of four parties only: Christian Democrats, Liberals, Labor Democrats, and Communists. Each party was given four posts in the government which, together with Bonomi and one technician, resulted in a Cabinet of 18 members. Two vice-premiers were appointed: Palmiro Togliatti, Communist, and Giulio Rodino, Christian Democrat and prewar liberal.⁴⁴

The Liberation Movement. Underground opposition to the fascist regime, operating under cover for twenty years, came out into the open after the Armistice. The first Committee of National Liberation (CNL) was organized in September, 1943, and branches were set up in most of the important cities. All groups of the population were represented. Labor cooperated by striking, use of sabotage, or fighting as Partisans (military arm of the CNL). Many units of the Army also went over to the Partisans. A general strike staged by the CNL in March, 1943, caused millions of workers to leave their jobs in spite of Nazi repressive tactics. In December, 1944, the CNL was recognized by the Bonomi Cabinet as its official representative in Northern Italy where it directed the fighting against Germans and fascists, settled political differences, and established and carried on local governments. Work of the CNL in northern Italy was highly commended by Allied military leaders who welcomed their military aid but opposed some of their political activities. In numerous instances, Partisans were disarmed by the Allies and CNL committees brushed aside while fascists or supporters of the monarchy were appointed to local governmental posts in their places. Later, more liberal policies towards the CNL were adopted.⁴⁵

Fall of the Bonomi Cabinet. The Allied official communiqué of February 25, 1945, conferred upon the Italian government full

⁴⁴ Cf. "Allied Tensions, Bonomi Presents Cabinet to Allies," *New York Times* (December 10, 1944); Ivor Thomas, "The Case of Count Sforza," *Contemporary Review*, CLXVII (February, 1945), pp. 71-76; and Hilda Fisher, "The Allies Blunder in Italy," *Current History*, VIII (January, 1945), pp. 52-56.

⁴⁵ Cf. Mario Rossi, *op. cit.*, XVI (May 19, 1945), pp. 569-570; J. E. Roper and J. C. Smith, "Fascist Finale," *Colliers* (June 16, 1945), pp. 20-21; and Angelo Crespi, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-344.

freedom of control over diplomatic officials and negotiations, and power to enact decrees and laws and appoint all administrative officials without formal approval of the AC. Nevertheless, rising discontent at Italy's unsolved problems focused blame upon Allied agencies in Italy and upon the Italian Cabinet which was forced to submit to their direction. Complaints centered around interference, particularly by the British, in Italian politics, retention of Humbert and other fascists in many governmental positions, failure to recognize and give representation to the CNL, slowness and ineffectiveness of the purge, delay in publication of the Armistice terms, discontent at overrepresentation of central and southern Italy in the Cabinet, and irritation at famine conditions, inflation, black markets, and general discomfort of the population. Strikes, riots, and lynchings of fascist suspects multiplied. Fascist fifth column activities were on the increase.

By April, 1945, about twenty political parties had emerged, headed in most cases by prewar leaders, and reflecting every shade of opinion from extreme Right to extreme Left. From Left to Right, major parties were: (1) Socialists, (2) Actionists, (3) Communists, (4) Christian Democrats, (5) Liberals, and (6) Democracy of Labor (Labor Democrats). Influenced, no doubt, by the stand of Soviet Russia in recognizing the Badoglio regime, the Communists officially supported the Monarchy and made friendly gestures towards the Church and its political organ, the Christian Democratic Party. However, the Communist rank and file seemed hostile to the House of Savoy. The Action Party, slightly more conservative than the Socialists, showed signs of breaking into two factions—one pro-Socialist, the other pro-Liberal. The Christian Democrats occupied the center and were split into a socialistic left wing and a right wing which backed Crown Prince Humbert and took a more conservative stand on political and economic questions. On the Right, the Liberal and Democracy of Labor parties both favored parliamentary institutions of the nineteenth-century type and supported the Monarchy. Of less importance numerically were the Republican and Democratic parties, traditional defenders of Throne and Altar.

In April, the Socialists and Communists consolidated their alliance but the Communists still remained inside the Cabinet. Attempts of the coalition to gain the adherence of the Christian Democrats were defeated, the latter officially taking up its prewar position in defense of the Monarchy. A definite split thus

emerged in the Bonomi Cabinet. In spite of attempts of Allied authorities to ease the situation by turning over Rome and other provinces to the government and in appointing radicals as mayors of various large cities, the pressure of leftist groups for a new deal backed by public opinion, particularly the liberation groups of northern Italy, proved too great and on June 18, 1945, the Bonomi Cabinet resigned.⁴⁶

The Parri Government—June-November, 1945. Reorganization of the Cabinet brought Professor Feruccio Parri to the fore as Premier and, by the inclusion of the Socialists and Action parties, marked a further shift of power to the left. A member of the Action Party and an outstanding leader of the CNL in northern Italy, Parri's ascension to power gave more complete recognition to native anti-fascist organizations, particularly the CNL whose leaders had become, in effect, an inner Cabinet of the government. Under Parri, the Cabinet was composed of 3 Socialists, 3 Actionists, 3 Labor Democrats, 4 Christian Democrats, and 1 Independent. Parri assumed the portfolio of Minister of the Interior, key to control of the police and local government. One of the two vice-presidencies of the Council was held by Pietro Nenni, leader of the Socialist Party, who was charged with making plans for the Constituent Assembly to be held at a later date. The other vice-presidency was given to Marilio Brasio, Liberal and Minister without portfolio in Bonomi's Cabinet. The other ministerial posts were divided among the six parties of the CNL. All members of the Cabinet were compelled to take the oath of office to Crown Prince Humbert and included in the oath was a pledge not to raise the question of the position of the Monarchy until the elections. This pledge was also reenforced by a warning from Admiral Ellery Stone, Chief Deputy for AC.⁴⁷

The new Cabinet took office under conditions verging on revolution. Mobs of anti-fascists demanding a more severe purge, food, and work, attacked jails in northern Italy and killed fascist prisoners. Demonstrations were made before AMG offices in various localities. CNL leaders, proposing to take over factories, were stopped only by AMG threats to cut off raw materials. Popular

⁴⁶ Cf. Gaetano Salvemini, "Dry Pogrom in Italy," *New Republic*, CXII (April 30, 1945), pp. 580-582; H. H. F. Eulau, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-111; and O. D. K. Ringwood and C. G. Haines "Politics in Liberated Italy," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XX (December 1, 1944), p. 236.

⁴⁷ See press despatches in *New York Times* for June 18, 19, 20, and 22, 1945.

resentment at Allied rule was increasing. Signor Parri called upon the Italian people to desist from lawlessness and work hard to win Allied trust and aid in supplies and credit. The Parri Cabinet proved to be short-lived. On November 24, due to dissatisfaction of Christian Democrats, Liberals, and Labor Democrats with the existing make-up of the Cabinet, Premier Parri handed his resignation to Crown Prince Humbert.

The Gasperi Government. After considerable jockeying for position and an appeal from Humbert, a Cabinet was formed December 10, 1945, with Alcide de Gasperi, Christian Democrat, as Premier. Parri and Bonomi were also included. Otherwise, the new Cabinet represented a mere reshuffling of the same persons and parties with a slight deviation to the Right due to the hold of the Christian Democrats on the Premiership and the Foreign Office. Though labor groups protested Parri's fall, the popular reaction was one of disappointment at the Cabinet for playing politics and refusing to deal adequately with political corruption, "conformism," job favoritism, and growing fascism in Italy.⁴⁸

The Gasperi Cabinet made plans for elections for the Constituent Assembly to draw up a new constitution and to determine whether Humbert should remain King. The Communists and Socialists intensified their attacks upon the House of Savoy while the Holy See supported the King not only through the Christian Democratic Party but by open exhortations to Catholics to vote for the Monarchy.

Monarchy Rejected. In the elections, held on June 2, 1946, the Italian people voted freely for the first time in more than twenty years. With northern Italy voting solidly for a republic and the south overwhelmingly for retention of the Monarchy, the issue was hotly contested. In result, 12,717,923 votes were cast for the republic and 10,719,284 for the Monarchy. After hesitating for some days, the Italian Supreme Court declared the election results to be a victory for the republic. King Humbert absolved all Italians from their oaths of allegiance to the King and left the country. The Gasperi Cabinet resigned. On June 28, Enrico de Nicola, a prewar politician, was elected provisional President of the Republic. The Consultative Assembly, established by executive decree, on September 25, 1945, to advise the Cabinet, ceased to exist. By the terms of the law, the Constituent Assembly was

⁴⁸ See press releases in the *Christian Science Monitor* (November 25, December 4 and 5, 1945).

to draw up a constitution for the new republic within eight months.

The Republican Regime. Early in July, de Gasperi again was called upon to head the Cabinet under the new republican regime. The Cabinet was a four-party coalition of Christian Democrats (which emerged from the June elections as the largest single party in terms of popular support), Socialists, Communists, and the National Democratic Union (Liberals and Labor Democrats). In the new coalition, the Christian Democrats took seven seats, the Socialists and Communists four each, the Democratic-Union and independents two each. The reorganized Cabinet reflects the shift to the Center which had occurred in the popular election. Thus, though the people voted for a Republic and ousted the Monarchy, they turned away from Communism, the Communists polling less than 19 per cent of the votes. The summer of 1946, therefore, saw the Italian people definitely embarked upon an experiment in democratic government. Their burdens were not lightened, however, by the terms of the Italian peace treaty emerging from the Paris and subsequent conferences.⁴⁹

The Peace Treaty. The Potsdam Declaration of August 3, 1945, indicated the principal peace terms that the Allies would impose upon Italy and instructed the newly created Council of Foreign Ministers to proceed immediately to draft the treaty. The Council met in Paris in the spring of 1946 and again in New York the following November. The official text of the Italian peace treaty of January 17, 1947, revealed that Italy had been stripped of her colonies and all the territorial gains acquired in World War I as well as considerable additional territory; left virtually defenseless by limitations upon her armed forces; and burdened with a reparations bill of \$360,000,000.

The major territorial loss was to Yugoslavia, which annexed the greater portion of Venezia Giulia and several islands in the Adriatic—an area of 3,000 square miles with a population of 500,000 persons. This area accounted for nearly 40 per cent of Italy's coal production. In addition the port-city of Trieste and its environs, an area of about 700 square kilometers with 330,000 inhabitants, was created an international free zone under the control of the United Nations. The Dodecanese Islands were

⁴⁹ Cf. *New York Times* (June 12, 14, 28, and July 12, 1946); G. E. Treves, "The Italian Republic," *Contemporary Review*, CLXX (July, 1946), pp. 15–20; and Angelo Crespi, "The New Italy," *op. cit.*, CLXX (August, 1946), pp. 65–69.

transferred to Greece and the other Italian colonies in Africa were taken away from Italy, their final disposition to be decided later. Italy was also obliged to accept five minor revisions of her frontier in France's favor. She was ordered to pay \$100,000,000, mainly in kind, to the Soviet Union, \$125,000,000 to Yugoslavia, \$105,000,000 to Greece, \$25,000,000 to Ethiopia, and \$5,000,000 to Albania. Italian armed forces were limited to an army of 185,000 men, 65,000 carabinieri, an air force of 25,000 men with 350 planes of all types, and a navy of two battleships, four cruisers and four destroyers. Moreover, all permanent Italian fortifications along the French and Yugoslav borders and on the islands retained by Italy were ordered demolished. In brief, Italy was reduced to the status of a minor military power with a relatively insignificant role in world affairs. The economic clauses of the treaty magnified all of her economic problems, particularly that of over-population.

Reaction to the Peace Terms. The terms of the peace, which became known in general at the end of the Paris Conference of the Council of Foreign Ministers, aroused great bitterness and disillusionment in Italy. There were violent anti-Allied demonstrations in Rome and other cities and prolonged disorders in Trieste between pro-Italian and pro-Yugoslav factions. The Western Allies were accused of "selling out Italy to Yugoslavia under the pressure exercised by the Soviet Union."

Internal Crisis Deepens. The humiliating consequences of Italian aggressions under the Fascist regime aggravated the internal political and economic problems faced by the Republic. Separatist movements developed in Sicily, Sardinia, and southern Italy, which threatened to rend Italy asunder after Allied troops were withdrawn. Strikes and disorders mounted as inflation and black market operations assumed more menacing proportions. The underground fascist movement became more active. A new neo-Fascist party, the "Common Man Front" led by Guglielmo Giannini, openly entered the political arena and in the June, 1946, elections won 1,198,000 votes and 30 seats in the Constituent Assembly.

The following October the Socialist and Communist parties formed a united front to press for the conquest of power by the working classes. The municipal elections held November 10 showed a decided drift of the voters away from Premier Gasperi's moderate Christian Democratic party toward the more extreme

parties of the Left and the Right. The Socialist party leader, Foreign Minister Pietro Nenni, attempted to arrange a merger of the Socialist and Communist parties at the Socialist party convention in Rome in January, 1947. But his plan was balked by the splitting away of a large section of the party to form a new Socialist movement hostile to cooperation with the Communists.

The Church under Attack. Further tension was introduced into Italy's many-sided political crisis by the developing struggle between the Vatican and Leftist elements determined to enforce the separation of Church and State. The Vatican had made clear its desire to maintain the Lateran Treaty of 1929, which established the Roman Catholic Church as an independent political entity, and the Concordat, which made Catholicism the state religion and gave the Church control over marriages and religious education in the schools. The Church threw its weight in favor of continuance of the Monarchy and against the spread of communism, but was itself the target of a vigorous anti-clerical campaign throughout the whole of Italy.⁵⁰ A Rome court on December 23, 1946, sentenced an anti-clerical editor to two years in prison for having "offended the religion of the state" by slandering clergymen.

Western Allies Extend Aid. In January, 1947, Premier de Gasperi flew to Washington in search of aid in meeting a serious food shortage which was provoking food riots and aggravating his government's political difficulties. He obtained a credit of \$100,000,000 from the Export-Import Bank to tide Italy over the crisis. In addition, six American ships carrying wheat to Bremen, Germany, were diverted in mid-ocean to Italian ports.

With liberal democracy in Italy struggling for survival against a reviving fascism on the one hand and communism on the other, the western Allies were finding it expedient to reverse their former repressive attitude toward liberal elements in the defeated country⁵¹ and extend full support to the forces of democracy in their efforts to find a solution of Italy's postwar dilemma.⁵²

Faced with famine, lowered vitality, the spread of disease, infla-

⁵⁰ G. Salvemini, "No Vatican Plan for Italy?" *Nation*, CLX (February 3, 1945), pp. 127-128.

⁵¹ Cf. G. A. Borgese, "Commemoration of Fascism," *Atlantic*, CLXXV (February, 1945), pp. 68-74; and H. H. F. Eulau, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-111.

⁵² Sergio Fenoltea, "Italy at Work: Achievements and Needs," *Foreign Affairs*, XXIV (July, 1946), pp. 715-722.

tion, and unemployment, the Italian people were on the verge of civil war. Much time will be required to rebuild her shattered economy and much more aid from the Allies will be necessary if disaster is to be averted. In order to succeed economically, Italy will be compelled to retrain her people in those industries and useful pursuits which fit her peculiar economic conditions. Without doubt, Italy must industrialize. The Swiss have shown that a nation, poor in natural resources, can still have a high standard of living. A liberal government could do much to equalize present excessive inequalities of wealth and income, provide land for tenant farmers and teach them cooperation and scientific farming.

RECENT TRENDS

The developments by the end of 1948 in Italy may be considered under two principal headings: (1) the adoption of the new Constitution and (2) the struggle for control of Italy by Soviet and United States forces.

1. After prolonged consideration, the Constituent Assembly approved the new Constitution by a vote of 453-62 and it came into effect on January 1, 1948. The new basic law proclaims Italy a Republic for all time and declares this article of the Constitution unamendable. Members of the former ruling House of Savoy are banned from Italy and refused the right to vote or hold office.

Concessions to the radicals are made in an elaborate Bill of Rights which limits the rights of property, grants workers an unlimited right to strike, and makes it obligatory upon the state to provide work for the unemployed. On the other hand, the dominance of religious and conservative elements in the Constituent Assembly is shown by the provisions recognizing freedom of religion but making the Catholic Church the established religion in Italy. The Lateran Accord of 1929 is made a part of the Constitution thus conferring special privileges upon the Catholic Church.

The President of the Republic is chosen by the National Assembly for a seven-year term by a two-thirds majority vote on the first two ballots or by an absolute majority if more ballots are required. He may be removed by the National Assembly by a majority vote for treason or violation of the constitution or laws of the Republic. No extraordinary powers are given him except

the right to refer bills in dispute between the two houses to a popular referendum.

Parliament consists of two houses of coequal powers—the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. Sitting together they constitute the National Assembly. Members of the Chamber of Deputies are elected by universal suffrage on the basis of one deputy for every 80,000 population. One class of senators is elected by universal suffrage on the basis of one from each province. In addition, three senators are chosen from each of the twenty-two newly created regions by the regional councils thereof. Members of both houses hold office for five years unless Parliament is dissolved sooner by executive decree. Members of each house have the right to introduce bills of all types and each House must pass upon all bills coequally. The Government (Cabinet) may introduce bills in either House.

As regards the Cabinet, the Premier is chosen by the President of the Republic. The other members of the Cabinet are chosen by the Premier and confirmed by the President. The Cabinet so selected must receive the approval of a majority of the National Assembly before entering upon office and can be removed in the same way.

The New Constitution creates a Constitutional Court on the order of the United States Supreme Court which has power to pass upon all questions of constitutionality of laws and conflicts of power between different branches of the government. It sits, also, as a Court of Impeachment for the President and ministers. Judges are appointed for nine years by the National Assembly.

Other interesting features include the popular initiative and referendum. An attempt is made to secure some regional autonomy through the creation of twenty-two regions with substantial administrative powers under Regional Councils whose acts are subject to review by the National Assembly.

The attempt to secure greater stability is evident in the creation of a powerful upper house and in making the Ministry responsible to the National Assembly. This seeks to avoid the ministerial crises characteristic of the French Cabinet which, under the Third Republic, was responsible to each of the houses; and to place checks upon over-hasty public opinion as represented in the lower house. The Constitutional Court serves the same purpose. It will be interesting to watch the working of this new experiment in constitution making.

2. Russia's bid for control of Italy through the activities of the Communist Party in Italy and the Italian Labor Unions was thwarted by American aid extended by voluntary gifts, the Interim Relief Bill, and the promise of more extensive assistance under the Marshall Plan. Extensive strikes and anti-Marshall Plan propaganda set on foot by Communist groups revealed their linkage with Moscow and resulted in a shift in public opinion farther to the Right, Communist Party representatives were ousted from the Cabinet and more conservative groups on the Right added to the preponderant plurality of the Christian Democrats under de Gasperi. Devaluation of the lira and other monetary reforms placed Italy on a better financial basis. Conservatives in the Executive Committee of the General Federation of Labor secured passage of resolutions curbing political strikes. The death of King Victor Emmanuel in Egypt on December 28, 1947, raised the question of the monarchy again and embarrassed the Government in view of the imminent promulgation of the new Constitution.⁵³

Meantime, actions of the United States in maintaining a powerful fleet in the Mediterranean, units of which made frequent visits to Italian ports led to protests from the U.S.S.R. on the grounds that they were a violation of the Italian Treaty. These were rejected by Italy as a violation of her sovereign rights as a nation. Reactivation of war-time American air bases in the former Italian colony of Libya led to further Russian protests to the United States but without avail. Since, under the Italian Treaty Italy's colonies were taken from her, she had no power to act in this case but it was becoming very clear that Italy and her former colonies were being used by the United States as bases for her sea and air power which were thus being readied to check any Russian attempts to break through into the Mediterranean via Italy or Greece.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALBRECHT-CARRIÉ, RENÉ, *Italy of the Paris Peace Conference* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938). Authoritative and fair statement of Italy's position and claims at the Versailles Conference.

ASCOLI, MAX, "Political Reconstruction in Italy," Chapter VI, pp.

⁵³ In the elections of April 18, 1948, Christian Democrats won 307 seats (48.7 per cent of votes cast) and Popular Front (Communists, Nenni Socialists, etc.) 182 (30.7 per cent).

- 319-328, in David Fellman, *Post-War Governments of Europe* (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publ. Co., 1946). Good on the changes in party politics.
- BOLTON, B., *A History of Italian Unity, 1814-1871* (London: Nisbet, 1924). 2 vols. A detailed history of Italy's struggle for unity.
- BORGESE, G. A., *Goliath: The March of Fascism* (New York: Viking, 1938). Literary and mystical but very informative in spots.
- EBENSTEIN, W., *Fascist Italy* (New York: American Book, 1939). Stresses Italy's problems under fascism to 1939.
- FINER, H., *Mussolini's Italy* (New York: Holt, 1935). An excellent critical appraisal up to 1935.
- GIBSON, HUGH, ed., *Ciano Diaries, 1939-1943* (New York: Doubleday, 1946). Ciano's inside story of the Fascist regime.
- GRIMDROD, M., *New Italy* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1947). Postwar Italy and her problems.
- HAIDER, CARMEN, *Do We Want Fascism?* (New York: Day, 1934). Discusses problems and successes of fascism with applications to the U.S.
- MATTHEWS, H. L., *The Fruits of Fascism* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1943). An interesting description of the rise and fall of fascism by an American correspondent in Italy.
- MUSSOLINI, B., *The Political and Social Doctrine of Fascism*, tr. by Jane Soames (London: Hogarth Press, 1934). Self-explanatory.
- SALVEMINI, G., *Under the Axe of Fascism* (New York: Viking, 1936). An excellent adverse critic of the Corporative State.
- SALVEMINI, G., and LA PIANA, G., *What To Do with Italy* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1943). Considers Italy's postwar problems from a liberal point of view.
- SCHMIDT, C. T., *The Corporative State in Action* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939). An excellent critical summary of the structure and performance of the Fascist industrial machine.
- SFORZA, C., *Contemporary Italy* (New York: Dalton, 1944). Another valuable contribution from this famous author.
- THOMAS, L., *The Problem of Italy* (London: Routledge, 1946). Deals effectively with the political and economic problems of post-war Italy.
- VILLARI, L., *Italy* (New York: Scribners, 1929). Informative but strongly pro-fascist.
- WELK, W. G., *Fascist Economic Policy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938). Ably examines the structure and functioning of the Fascist economic system.
- ZURCHER, A. J., "The Government and Politics of Italy," in J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940). A very complete and adequate analysis of Italy's Fascist regime up to 1940.

SPAIN

The question of Spain, and to a lesser degree that of Portugal, represents a collection of clashing national interests, fighting on the barren level of power politics. Both countries have been plagued by poverty and ignorance and both have evolved a type of government which resembles closely the Fascist and Nazi regimes. At the same time, however, the Spanish and Portuguese brand of politics resembles closely the type evolved in the Balkans. It is characterized by: the marked discrepancy between the symbolic value of constitutional terminology and the widespread disregard of democratic formulas in practice; maintenance of the government by force, theoretically justified as the natural evolution from, and a better substitute for, bankrupt and discredited previous regimes; emphasis on the "superior" men as the natural leaders of the political scene, manipulating adroitly the magic wand of elections and plebiscites controlled by military power; absence of a broad structure of public opinion; the wide gap between the masses and the upper ruling classes, intensified by the reign of terror and memories of the civil war in Spain; the use of violence and rebellion as the accepted method of political change; and the constant interference of the army cliques in political processes.

GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Spain is an explosive entity within the unstable continent of Europe. Should Spain become a modern, powerful country it could control the gateway to the western Mediterranean and the shipping lanes between France and her empire in North Africa. As the country that discovered the Western Hemisphere and colonized a large part of it, it could extend its already great influence in the Spanish-speaking countries. Furthermore, the special position of the Catholic Church in Spain is a matter of prime interest to the entire Catholic world and consequently to all

western civilization. But the possibility of another civil war in Spain in 1947 hung over all efforts to evolve an effective social and economic order.

On the surface, Spain appeared to have recovered from the worst effects of civil war. The shops were stocked with all kinds of manufactured goods. In residential and business districts of large cities people were well dressed. But the rubble of buildings bombed during the war was still visible in most of the cities. Practically none of Spain's factories had been damaged (ground fighting was chiefly in agricultural regions, bombing from the air trifling compared to that of World War II), and all the factories, lands, and other recoverable property seized by the labor unions had been returned to their owners—including the small acreage expropriated under the agrarian-reform law of the Republic before the civil war. World War II's ending appeared responsible for some revival of Spanish industry. Any Spanish manufacturer could sell anything he could make. Prices, however, were often fantastic.

The American and British governments had poured \$160,000,000 into the Spanish economy since 1941. Most of this sum was spent for wolfram, the ore of tungsten, indispensable in the making of armor and armor-piercing bullets. Germany's only sources of wolfram had been Spain and Portugal, and the Allies had spent and spent to keep her from getting it—and claimed they were successful. But the more the Allies bought, the more wolfram Spain mined. Production tripled. Prices went up faster than production and reached twenty times the normal price. Germany managed, however, to compete with the Allies by typical Nazi sleight-of-hand finance. At the end of the civil war Franco owed Germany about 400,000,000 marks (and Italy five billion lire) for aid rendered during the war. By October, 1943, the German debt was repaid and Germany owed Spain 200,000,000 marks. Germany then came through with cash and shipments of obsolete armaments and manufactured goods, thereby reducing her debt to about 75,000,000 marks by April, 1944.

Franco helped Germany without risking war with the Allies as long as there was the possibility of a German occupation of Spain. But by the end of 1943 Allied military power had grown to the point where it could dictate, mildly, to Spain, a fact that apparently passed unperceived in Madrid. Franco believed World War II would end in a stalemate and that he could play both ends against the middle. The Spanish Foreign Office carried on mild

flirtation with Japan's puppet ruler in the Philippines and Franco granted a new credit to Germany of \$40,000,000. It was this latter move that caused the United States oil embargo of January, 1944 (lifted four months later).¹

When the Allies assembled at Gibraltar the ships for the North African invasion, Franco remained passive—and got a vocal pat on his ample back from Prime Minister Churchill for the good deed. Furthermore, Franco agreed to settle in full Spain's pre-civil-war debt to American companies (about \$11,000,000), and the United States and British purchasing commissions, controlling all overseas supplies to Spain, were able to reprieve to some extent the cost of preemptive purchases in that country by putting surcharges on all strategic goods that Spain imported from overseas. The flirtation with the Philippines was explained away as the act of an employee of the Foreign Office without the knowledge of either Franco or Foreign Minister Count Jordana.

The liberation of France removed the Nazis from the Spanish border and also the Allied need to buy Spanish wolfram. The honeymoon on Allied money that World War II had given Franco's regime was over.

Geography. Located on a peninsula jutting from another peninsula (Europe), Spain is separated from Europe by the Pyrenees mountains stretching from the Bay of Biscay to the Mediterranean. This border has but few natural passageways. On the other hand, the Spanish peninsula can be approached from the east by way of the Balearic Islands, and from the south by way of the peninsula of Tangier and the Strait of Gibraltar. About the size of California (approximately 190,000 square miles), Spain has a subtropical climate (except for the northern regions). The coastal regions produce a wealth of tropical fruits, but there are also arid central plateaus on which sheep flourish only by a migratory existence. The contrasts are also obvious in the highly civilized and prosperous urban centers and hinterlands of primitive peasants living much as did their medieval ancestors. The geography of the country is dominated by the central expanse of arid land. About 60 per cent of the total area of the Iberian peninsula is non-agricultural, with some regions containing rich deposits of minerals. Irrigation is necessary in most

¹ According to "Spain: Unfinished Business," *Fortune* (March, 1945), p. 141 ff., "forty million dollars was about equal to the credit balance Spain had accumulated in dollars and sterling as a direct result of Allied purchases in Spain."

agricultural sections. Along the Mediterranean coast lies the Catalanian plain with its industrial cities.

Spain has never recovered from the loss of her empire. Before World War II Spain was the third largest of the states of Europe, but her population was only about 23 million. Agriculture was poorly developed, railway communications were bad, and her vast resources of minerals were scarcely touched.

The Basic Problem of Spain. The Spanish land is still owned in a feudal way—with the important exception that landowners are no longer responsible for their peasants' welfare. The land system is otherwise medieval, 90 per cent of the holdings consisting of parcels of less than 10 hectares. The *minifundia* are farms not quite large enough to maintain a family decently. Farmers with short-term leases fare little better than the peasants. Relative prosperity occurs only where long-term leases are the rule. The result of feudal ownership is a low standard of living, industrial stagnation, and instability of government. Sixty million acres of the Spanish land can be cultivated; from 60 to 70 million are good only for grazing or are brushland; and 15 million are totally unproductive. The excellent soil in eastern Spain along the Mediterranean shore is useless unless irrigated. Because the ancient irrigation systems of the Moors were never rebuilt, the good soil of the Guadalquivir valley suffers from excessive evaporation.

Minorities. Racially, the people are more purely Mediterranean than those of any other European country. Of some importance is the Basque minority (less than 1,000,000) of the western Pyrenees. Intense separatism is propagated by the Catalans, whose separatism is due more to economic and political than to racial causes. They speak a language akin to, but substantially differing from, Spanish, and inhabit Spain's most important industrial region. Galicians, Basques, and Catalans joined the Socialists, Anarchists, and Communists in the civil war of 1936-39 because the Republic granted them provincial autonomy. Immediately after victory Franco obliterated autonomy everywhere in Spain—including Catalonia.

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF POLITICS

The average citizen does not need to be told that Spain has a tradition of despotic rule. But he may need to be reminded that

it has also produced some of the sublimest expressions of democratic, humanitarian thought. Many standard histories of the Spanish peninsula give a false impression of the events they describe, due chiefly to the fact that Spain, both economically and psychologically, "differs so greatly from the other countries of Western Europe that the words of which most history is made—feudalism, autocracy, liberalism, Church, Army, Parliament, trade union and so forth—have quite other meanings there to what they have in France or England."²

Localism. Spain, first of all, is the land where every village, every town is the centre of an intense social and political life, and a man's allegiance is first of all to his native place (or to his family or social group in it) and only secondly to his country and government. "In what one may call its normal condition Spain is a collection of small, mutually hostile or indifferent republics held together in a loose federation."³ The main political problem has always been how to strike a balance between an effective central government and the needs of local autonomy. As a result, Spain has always been a difficult country to govern. Politics are municipal or tribal and in this sense real—that the man on the losing side pays a forfeit. Personal relations dominate the scene.

The root cause of Spain's political troubles is the fact that Spain has never had an industrial revolution. There is simply not enough land for the Spanish people. It is true that the Church lands and the common lands were seized in the nineteenth century; but they were not made available to the peasants. A third of the Spanish latifundia, the large landed estates, are owned by the nobles and grandees, two-thirds by urban *nouveaux riches*. The peasants, where there is work for them, do not earn enough to buy the products of what little industry Spain has, situated chiefly in the north, in Catalonia and the Basque provinces.

Opposition to Centralism. The Catalans and Basques have always resented the political domination of Castile—that mountain-encircled plateau of central Spain where the monarchy, the landowners, the Church hierarchy, and the perennial juntas of army generals have cohered and quarrelled and maintained a highly centralized government. This resentment is also felt by

² Gerald Brenan, *The Spanish Labyrinth* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), p. vii.

³ *Ibid.*

the Socialist trade unions in Madrid, the anarcho-syndicalist workers of Catalonia, the anarchist peasants of Andalusia, and whole rank and file of left and right republicans and Basque and Catalan nationalists.

The nub of the Spanish dilemma is how an agrarian revolution can take place in the south and west without engulfing all Spain. Even the exiled Spanish politicians cannot agree how this can be accomplished. Furthermore, they cannot agree even upon the way to get rid of Franco or the way to rule Spain after he is gone.

Class Struggle. To this basic problem are added a class stratification and a class struggle. There are so many crisscrossing ideological divisions in Spanish labor that unity for action seems impossible. It often was so during the civil war. Spanish labor is chiefly anarchist or socialist. Catholic trade unions have been only moderately successful, largely because the Church seldom sides with the people. The Catalanian *rabassaires*, for example, turned from Catholicism to radicalism when the Church did not support them in a fundamental dispute over the length of time vineyard leases should run.

Provincialism. The class divisions are, furthermore, affected by the provincial question. Before Franco, there was Catalan nationalism in the east among the middle classes and anarcho-syndicalism in the south among the factory workers and agricultural laborers. In Castile there was an authoritarian Catholic conservatism based on land tenure and an equally authoritarian Marxism deriving its strength from land hunger. In the north the autonomist movements were linked to an ultra-Catholic, agrarian creed known as Carlism (Traditionalism).⁴ The backbone of every autonomist movement is the discontent of the petite bourgeoisie; hence their local jingoism is mainly economic. The inability of the ruling classes to give honest government to Spain or to show the least regard for the provincial complaints has made Spain the classic land of insurrections.

Church. The influence of the Church must not be left out from

⁴ The first Carlist war (1833-1840) was fought in Spain by men who believed the inquisition should return and who considered the Constitution of 1812 a pestilence. They also believed in autonomy for the Basque provinces, from which many Carlists came. This question of provincial autonomy versus Castilian domination, of federalism versus centralism, was prominent in the second Carlist war (1872-1876), in the course of which the first Spanish Republic, after one year of feeble life, expired. The second Republic did not come for 58 years.

any analysis of the Spanish brand of politics. For eight centuries the Spaniards devoted themselves to driving the Moslems out of Europe as their vocation. But when complete exhaustion set in in the seventeenth century, the holy war was still carried on. The clergy still remained the guardians of all the ideological ambitions of the Spaniards. When, in 1812, the Church and the Liberals started to settle their differences on a political plane, a seven-year civil war was the result. Though the Church lost, politics and religion were left fatally entwined—and have not been separated ever since. A general decay of religion set in at the beginning of the twentieth century, particularly among the middle and then the working classes, and was replaced by anarchism or socialism. Both doctrines were propounded with the same crusading spirit as Catholicism in the previous centuries—with the results that no compromise among the competing political ideologies in Spain has ever been found.

Crown. The Crown, whose role was to act as a moderating and mediating force, failed to discharge its proper task. A row of disreputable sovereigns discredited the monarchy. Corrupt elections destroyed faith in the *Cortes* and military *pronunciamientos* compromised the army. The Government, to most Spaniards, was but the clique of corrupt politicians temporarily in power. The changes in government occurred when army dictatorships or reactionary governments were interrupted every few years by military revolutions (since the middle of the nineteenth century). In fact, since 1814 no Liberal government had come into power except by violence. Efforts were made to have Conservative governments succeeded regularly by Liberal governments. But there was no longer any difference between them—except that the Liberals were anti-clerical and interested in education while the Conservatives professed a mild concern for agriculture and social conditions. Whatever government conducted the elections won them, since the electioneering machine had its apex in the Home Office.⁵

Parties. In general, party organization consisted of local clubs and committees, provincial juntas and central directorates in Madrid. The major parties were controlled by the parliamentary clique, especially by the party chief, but all parties revolved more or less about personalities. Before World War I, because of the

⁵ For the electoral practices, see Brenan, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-7.

individualism and localism of the Spanish peoples, the patriarchal character of society, the ignorance of the masses, the sham elections and the backwardness of communications, party organization was not highly developed in Spain. In the background of all political machinations were the two great forces of the nineteenth century—the Army and the Church: when divided there was chaos, and when united there was oppression. While, before 1900, Conservative and Liberal governments had been succeeding one another, the contest suddenly became acute after that year. During the previous 25 years the Church had been steadily growing in strength and resources and now decided to regain the dominating position it had once held in the state. On the other hand the forces of anti-clericalism had been growing also. The chief points of issue were the limitation of the number of religious orders, the toleration of other religions and the control of education. But the Liberals found that they were barely able to hold their own; the only gain was the permission granted to the Protestant churches to erect a cross or other symbol over their doors.

ALFONSO'S REIGN

Under Alfonso's rule, Spain's politics was viewed more or less hopelessly by the masses. The more honest and capable political leaders looked for remedies from the King with whose good will the legislation which was blocked by the Chamber could be passed by decree and ministries could be established. But King Alfonso was, unfortunately, not the man who could solve Spain's tangle of conflicting political and social interests. Alfonso XIII was born King of Spain on May 17, 1886, and reigned until April 14, 1931, when the establishment of the Republic forced him into exile.⁶

As King his life had been hectic enough, but as an exile it was marked by many tragedies. He separated from his wife, the grand-

⁶After the civil war his confiscated property, worth about \$8,500,000, was returned to him and his citizenship, which had been revoked when the Republican government declared him guilty of high treason, was restored by the Spanish Nationalist government. But no move was openly made to replace him on the throne from which he had fled, but which, as he insisted until his last illness, he had not abdicated. He finally issued a manifesto renouncing his rights in favor of his son.

daughter of Queen Victoria of Britain. In 1933 his eldest son, the former Prince of the Asturias, who had suffered greatly from hemophilia, died from injuries received in an automobile crash while riding with a Miami (Florida) night club cigarette vendor. Previously another son had died from the same bleeding malady. Another son was born deaf and could barely speak.

Alfonso's reign, like his exile, was frequently marked by tragedy. On at least eight separate occasions there were major attempts on his life. From his earliest youth he had been a keen sportsman, and he captivated his subjects and people all over the world by his exploits as a yachtsman, polo player, hunter and daring automobile driver. Hardly a month passed in all the years of his reign in which Alfonso did not give some proof of courage. For instance, on April 13, 1913, Rafael Sanches Allegre, an anarchist, fired three shots at the King at point-blank range after a public function at Madrid. Alfonso turned his horse and with great presence of mind rode down his attacker.

Downfall. The swelling tide of Alfonso's popularity came to an abrupt end when he decided to take a hand in the Moroccan campaign (1921). Twenty thousand soldiers were trapped by the Riff tribesmen and half of them were killed before the remnant struggled back to safety, morally and physically routed. In Spain a hue and cry went up for punishment of those responsible. Alfonso had to act swiftly. Two courses were open to him—to step forward, shoulder the blame, and trust that his popularity among his subjects would enable him to weather the crisis, or to shelter himself under the wing of his army. Alfonso chose the latter course. Backed by royal approval, General Miguel Primo de Rivera forestalled all plans for finding scapegoats for the Moroccan fiasco by staging the military *coup d'état* of 1923, an attempt to maintain the monarchy and conservative clerical domination, particularly against the attack of the economic radicalism of revolutionary communist or non-political anarcho-syndicalist forces. The Spanish Parliament was dissolved and the country placed under military dictatorship. Seven years of Primo de Rivera and a short period of the Berenguer dictatorship were enough to bring public opinion to a seething point of revolt.

On Sunday, April 12, 1931, votes were actually counted in a Spanish election for the first time since 1873. The result was an overwhelming victory for those who wanted a republic instead

of a monarchy. Alfonso XIII headed his racing car toward the sea and left Spain without a shot being fired. The key to these events was the Anarchist vote—1,250,000 strong.⁷

THE REPUBLIC

Spain's first Republic, which lasted from 1864 to 1874 had been liberal. It had been ended by a military coup, backed up by the Church and the landed aristocracy. The Second Republic, founded in 1931 on the departure of Alfonso, was to end in the same way. Its strength was principally in the cities, where the Republicans, Socialists and Communists had won 51 per cent of the local councillors as against 48.5 per cent for the monarchists. Changes were made in the election law prior to the new Cortes elections of June, 1931, giving more equitable representation to the towns; and the Republican-Socialist coalition won a decisive victory.⁸

Gains Under the Second Republic. Spain achieved some phenomenal gains under the Second Republic. A new model constitution was drawn up.⁹ A unicameral legislature was formed. The army was reorganized. A new charter of liberties for the workers was put in operation. The redistribution of the land was begun. The schools were revolutionized, thousands of new ones having been opened. An enormous public works program was instituted. The troublesome question of Catalan autonomy was solved; Galicians, Basques, and Catalans joined with Socialists, Anarchists, and Communists because the Republic granted them provincial autonomy. And the Church was segregated from the state.¹⁰

⁷ When the Anarchists deliberately stayed away from the polls, as in 1933, the rightist parties had a majority. Thus the Anarchists could tip the election scales—when there were elections.

⁸ The best collection of material on this period can be found in Walter C. Langsam and J. M. Eagan, *Documents and Readings in the History of Europe Since 1918* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1939), chapter 8, "Spain," pp. 589-645, R. S. Kahn, ed., *Europe Versailles to Warsaw* (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1939), "Spain: A Nation in Flux," pp. 214-231, and bibliography, pp. 417-449.

⁹ R. M. Smith, *The Day of the Liberals in Spain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938), chapter III, "The Constitutional Evolution of Spain," pp. 33-56, and bibliography pp. 323-337, traces the evolution of the constitutional system in Spain.

¹⁰ By voting with the Popular Front coalition of leftist parties in 1936 the Anarchists made it possible for the Republic to institute some of the reforms Spain so desperately needed—and needs.

Forces of Opposition and Division. But there were several sources of powerful opposition to the Republic, abroad, as well as at home. Powerful landowners, employers and the Church were unwilling to lose the advantages they had held for centuries. The country was split, both vertically and horizontally, into a number of mutually antagonistic sections. There were the movements for local autonomy in Catalonia and among the Basques, both opposed by an equally intransigent centralist block in Castile; the struggle represented, from a social angle, a revolt on the part of the industrial interests in Spain against government by landowners. From another angle, Castilian centralism represented the Army backed by the middle-class landowners—the chief gainers from the abortive Liberal Revolution of the early nineteenth century. Furthermore, the Army collected around itself the other conservative elements, the King and the Church and the “respectable” people afraid of any trend to the left. The working classes were divided into the Socialists and the Anarcho-Syndicalists and their lines of division were again complicated by regionalism. While Socialism represented Castilian centralism, Anarcho-Syndicalistic forces came from the federal and autonomous movements of the east and south. Socially, the Socialists represented the urban proletariat and shopworkers, the Anarcho-Syndicalists the landless laborers of the large estates (with the exception of Catalonia).

Under all the difficulties lay the agrarian question. “Reactionary farmers in Navarre (Carlists), peasants with a grievance in Catalonia (*rabassaires*), insurrectionary day labourers in Andalusia (anarchists), revolutionary peasant farmers and labourers on the Central tableland and in Extremadura (Socialists)—all have made their contribution to the witches’ cauldron.”¹¹

Rule by Left and Right. In general, Spain’s history after the founding of the Republic can be roughly divided into four two-year periods, two of which were dominated by the Leftists and two by the Rightists. Two years of rule by the Left (December, 1931 to November, 1933) were followed by two years under Centrist and Rightist leaders (November, 1933 to February, 1936); after an interim of a few months under the Leftist “Popular Front,” came civil war (July, 1936 to January, 1939), followed by a period of fascism.

¹¹ Brenan, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

Leftist rule, with Alcala Zamora as President and Manuel Azaña as Premier, was a chaotic period of trial and error. A number of constructive reforms were launched but none worked out completely. Only the clerical problem was handled with vigor; Church and state were separated, religious equality proclaimed, and the property of clerical orders confiscated, the Jesuit order banned and clerical influence in education reduced to the vanishing point. But most of this legislation was invalidated by the fall of the Leftist government in 1933. More progress was achieved in military reforms; but many of the pensioned officers started intriguing against the Republic. The most needed reform was the agrarian law which provided for the abolition of ancient feudal dues and the expropriation of all uncultivated land and all estates of exiled monarchists, plus the confiscated church properties. But the politicians took their time debating this law and when they finally agreed to pass it, the Leftist government was on the way out.

The Azaña government was more ready to take radical steps when dealing with the syndicalist rebels in Catalonia and Bilbao, monarchists in Madrid, discontented republicans in Seville, peasants at Casas Viejas, and radical students of the Madrid University. Restrictions on the press and a more rigid law of Public Order added to a discontent which was evident in the November, 1933, elections. Out of 473 seats in the Cortes, the Leftists retained only 99. The balance of power swung to the Center (167 seats) and Right (207) parties. The political change, however, supplanted Leftist tyranny by the petty feuds of the politicians of the Center and Right. The government degenerated into a succession of falling ministries. The Catalan regional autonomy question induced the Catalan deputies to walk out of the Cortes. The Barcelona radicals started a quickly suppressed revolt. As a result Catalonia lost her autonomy. Widespread disturbances were troubling the country.

In January, 1936, the government called for the election of a new Cortes. A Leftist coalition under Azaña, called the "Popular Front," won a sweeping victory. Radicalism was again in the ascendancy. But there were widespread murders and riots and some 170 churches were burned. Peasant outbreaks took place as the new government failed to speed the distribution of lands long promised by republican politicians. The spring and early summer of 1936 were passed in a continual effervescence. Spain stood

on the verge of anarchy. The government was weak and did nothing although everyone knew that the army officers were preparing a rising and that a civil war was imminent. "The Prime Minister, Casares Quiroga, was a consumptive; he reacted to the danger of the situation by an optimism that would have to be considered insane if it were not a symptom of his disease."¹²

FRANCO'S REVOLT

On July 16, 1936, the Army in the Spanish zone of Morocco rose and occupied Ceuta and Melilla. Instead of acting, the government issued a proclamation that "nobody, absolutely nobody in Spain had taken part in this absurd plot."¹³

On July 17, 1936, the Civil War in Spain started with a revolt by Gen. Francisco Franco's regiments; on the following day, the generals at various military centers joined the revolution. It was not until midnight on Saturday the 18th that the government order for distributing arms to the people was issued. But even then some of the Civil Governors refused to obey it. The Popular Front disintegrated, with the Communists in most regions taking the lead in local defense, characterized by general strikes and the summoning of the workers to arms.

The military junta and group of right-wing politicians which rose against the government had at their disposal the Civil Guard, the Foreign Legion, a division of Moorish troops from Spanish Morocco, four-fifths of the infantry and artillery officers and a certain number of regiments recruited in the north. They also had the Carlist levies (*requetes*) which had for some time been drilling secretly and the promise of Italian and German tanks and airplanes. Against these the government had only the Republican Guards and a small and badly armed airforce.

The result of the war was finally decided by foreign help. Franco, whose armies landed in the south and slowly gained control of central and eastern Spain, was actively supported by Hitler, Mussolini and Salazar (of Portugal); the Loyalists obtained material and some reinforcements from France and Russia, but it was slow in coming. The Loyalists were the principal sufferers from the embargo placed on all arms shipments to Spain

¹² Brenan, *op. cit.*, p. 312.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

by the United States, Britain and the smaller democratic powers. Loyalist resistance collapsed when Franco's troops entered Madrid on March 28, 1939.

El Caudillo. General Franco became ruler of Spain by a lucky combination of circumstances. He was not intended to be the leader of the rebellion of July, 1936, but Lady Luck killed off his rivals, Calvo Sotelo, and General Sanjurjo, the braintrusters of the insurrection, who made all the preliminary arrangements for help from Rome and Berlin. Franco had served in the Spanish army in Morocco, became Colonel in 1926, served under the republic in the Balearic Islands and again in Morocco, and became chief of staff in 1935. From Morocco he organized the military uprising in 1936 and assumed the leadership of the insurgents when General Sanjurjo was killed in an airplane crash. On Oct. 1, 1936, he proclaimed himself Chief of State (*Caudillo*) and Commander-in-Chief.

Franco's original idea of the rebellion was to accomplish a military coup, on the South American model, for the purpose of restoring the old privileges of the Church and the great landowners who felt that their property rights were threatened by the reform measures of the republican government. But Nazi and Fascist help induced him to proclaim fascist principles, and he became the nominal head of the Falange Española, or Fascist Party, playing the role of moderator in the frequently recurring differences between Falange leaders and conservative army circles. Only five feet and three inches tall, he is plump and round-headed, with large expressive eyes. He won dictatorial power in one of the bloodiest civil wars in modern history, which cost a million lives, incapacitated a million more, and settled absolutely nothing. It ended in a totalitarian state that, like almost everything in Spain, was not analogous to totalitarian states elsewhere at that time, except for the fact that a single political party, the Falange, dominated everything. General Franco was certain by 1947 of only one thing: as so often before in their history the Spanish people again waited—to get rid of their ruler.

THE FRANCO REGIME

The Falange. The key instrument of Franco's dictatorship was the Falange Española which organized the systematic repression

of all opposition forces. There was no freedom of press, worship, or public assembly. Four different kinds of secret police and armed guards spied on the populace. Travel was possible only after the police had given permission. Employment in civil service and in private offices, in factories, and on the land depended upon the good will of the Falange, which supervised or managed all production and distribution. Four hundred thousand of Spain's skilled and unskilled workers, engineers, and managers fled from Spain at the end of the civil war to escape the Falange concentration camps and prisons. After the liberation of France many previously released political prisoners were rearrested and summarily executed, without charge or trial. The Falange ruled Spain by martial law.

The Falange was founded by José Antonio Primo de Rivera, son of the dictator who ruled Spain from 1923 to 1930. Primo de Rivera, the father, had given Spain a dictatorial but relatively efficient regime. He left behind a network of good roads, state-owned oil wells in Venezuela, a fleet of tankers to transport the oil, and refineries in the Canary Islands. But his dictatorship disintegrated, as all dictatorships eventually do in Spain. After his downfall, tales of corruption and venality were spread about him. His son set out to combat the slanderers by founding a political party. He believed in the inevitability of totalitarianism in the modern world.

Until the civil war, his movement labored against a great handicap. Spain had no Communist movement to speak of (only some 3,000 members).¹⁴ The ruling classes were not interested in the Falange; they were convinced that the Army could always be relied upon for a *pronunciamiento*, which in Spain amounts to a seizure of power. The common people were also uninterested in the Falange, since Spain's revolutionary is traditionally anarchistic—opposed to statism and dictatorships of the left as well as of the right.

Ideology. When Franco and his conspirators plunged Spain into civil war, they had not elaborated a popular long-term political program of their own. It is even likely that they were thinking of the ultimate restoration of the monarchy with its traditional advantages to the Army. They wanted, substantially,

¹⁴ The pro-Franco studies naturally emphasize the Communist dangers in Spain. But it is worth noting that Primo de Rivera, the dictator, suppressed the Anarchist unions and newspapers, but did not bother the Communist *Mundo Obrero*.

another Primo de Rivera dictatorship. When the country had to go through its long internal civil strife, Franco was compelled to extend his appeal to the working and lower-middle classes. Thus it was that the Spanish Fascists, the blue-shirted *Falangistas*, recruited largely from the lower-middle class, together with the ne'er-do-wells and dubious intellectuals in the middle class, the nobility, and the *pistoleros* of the underworld, saw a chance to advance themselves under the aegis of the Germans and the Italians aiding Franco. Franco and his original military and ecclesiastical supporters were at first embarrassed by the enthusiastic and anti-clerical *Falangistas* who were united in one organization with the much older, more soldierly, more monarchical, and devoutly Catholic *Requetes*. The Falange became an important factor when Franco wanted to advance himself over the Army officers who had appointed him Generalissimo and Chief of State. He needed political support for his ascendancy, and the Falange—modelled after the Fascist and Nazi parties—served this purpose. On April 19, 1937, Franco unified the ranks of his supporters by merging the *Falangistas* and *Requetes* into a single party (*Falange Española Tradicionalista de las J.O.N.S.*). The Falange's 26 points¹⁵ were adopted as the platform of the new party, and the *Requetes* were awarded a less substantial declaration that the way was not closed to re-establishment of the monarchy.¹⁶

The extent of Franco's personal power in the movement was revealed in the last paragraph of the decree, which said: "Interpretation of the statutes and documents of the movement rests with El Caudillo (the leader), who alone may determine the circumstances and the pace of the movement in continuing the tradition of those who feel for glorious Spain. The Caudillo is the supreme chief of the movement. As the author of the historic

¹⁵ Originally there were twenty-seven points of the Falange, but the last point, demanding that young men under forty be given leading positions in the government, was not accepted by Franco, who was then forty-five, according to Thomas J. Hamilton, *Appeasement's Child: The Franco Regime in Spain* (New York: Knopf, 1943), pp. 73-74.

¹⁶ Franco's totalitarian party retained few of its founders and original leaders by 1947. José Antonio Primo de Rivera was executed by the Republicans—after Franco refused to exchange for him a prominent Republican he had captured. Gamero del Castillo, former secretary of the party, and others were expelled for signing a letter written by thirty prominent monarchists asking Franco to restore the monarchy. Serrano Suñer, Franco's brother-in-law and former head of the Falange's political junta, was also eliminated.

era in which Spain has the opportunity to rule her destiny, he assumed absolute authority. He is responsible only before God and history."

This decree spurred dissension between fascists and monarchists within the Falange. Several outstanding monarchists were removed from their posts. Serrano Suñer was appointed president of the Falange political junta and Minister of Government, controlling public order, interior affairs, and public health during his term in office (resigning in 1943). The man instrumental in Suñer's removal, José Luis de Arrese, secretary general of the Falange, succeeded to the highest post in Franco's cabinet.¹⁷

Administration. The *Falange Española Tradicionalista de las J.O.N.S.* (the last four letters signifying *Juntas Ofensivas Nacional Sindicalistas*) is ruled by a National Council of 100 members (*Consejeros Nacionales*), assisted by a *Junta Política*. The party has its own militia. The economic policy of the state is centered on vertical syndicates, formed under the Charter of Labor in the law of August 8, 1939, and classified into twenty-five branches of production. All employers, workers, and distributors of an industry must belong to these syndicates. In addition, there are regional syndicates, composed of representatives of the national syndicates within a province. The civil governor of the province, appointed by Franco, is the chief of the regional syndicate. The heads of the regional syndicates and of the national syndicates make up the Falange's National Council. This clique administers and controls Spain. The new Cortes that Franco created is a rubber stamp, for all appointments are made from top to bottom.¹⁸

Army influence in the party was strengthened August 4, 1937, when Franco proclaimed the statutes of the organization: all commissioned and non-commissioned officers were automatically declared members. The decree prescribed that the members of the National Council, to number between 25 and 50, should be named by the Caudillo. The statutes also provided for trade-

¹⁷ "Spain: Unfinished Business," *Fortune* (March 1, 1945), p. 146

¹⁸ The basic distinction between Franco's and Mussolini's corporative systems is that the Falange syndicates were originally patterned after the anarcho-sindicalist unions and designed to catch the million and a quarter Spanish workers who were Anarchists. The Falange adopted for its flag the red and black colors of the Anarchists. But any other similarity between anarcho-sindicalist unions and the Falange syndicates is fictitious, since the Anarchist unions left all final decisions on all questions to the rank and file.

unions (syndical) organizations under party control, to regulate labor and the production and distribution of goods.

On January 30, 1938, Franco went further toward setting up a formal government. For the technical junta formed in the fall of 1936 he substituted, by decree, a cabinet of twelve portfolios. Franco retained supreme control as president of the cabinet and commander of the armed forces. Both groups of monarchists—the Alfonsists and the Carlists—as well as the Falange, were represented in the cabinet. A decree, August 4, 1939, reinforcing Franco's absolute powers, established the totalitarian dictatorship on a permanent basis, with the Falange as the only legal political party. It was announced that Franco would secretly appoint his successor, whose name was to be revealed only after his death.

Two supreme organs under Franco's authority are provided for: a national Falangist council and a political junta. The junta, however, was to intervene in national affairs only on delegation from the council, over which Franco presides at all sessions. Half of the junta's members are named by Franco. The National Council has 75 members and acts on matters of general policy.

In 1945, a decree defining the Council of State was published. The top consultative body in Spain, this Council, originally instituted under the monarchy, was revamped under the republic and tentatively accepted by Franco during the civil war. The decree gave it new form. The members are ex-officio and elective, the former including the Spanish Primate, the general secretary of the Falange and the rector of the National University. The electives were to be chosen from among former ministers, the church hierarchy, and top-ranking Army and Navy officers. General Franco, of course, headed the entire body.

The local government consists of provinces, each with its own assembly, made of the association of municipalities. They are headed by the *Ayuntamiento* who is appointed by the government and authorized to determine the organization of each municipality. The Mayor, together with the Councillors, is likewise appointed by the Government. The *Diputaciones Provinciales* are the sole administrators of the provinces. The judicial system is built up of the Supreme High Court, 15 Divisional High Courts, 50 Provincial High Courts, 551 Courts of First Instance, and 9,364 District Courts (or Courts of lowest jurisdiction held by Justices of the Peace).

Promises versus Performance. Franco's promises to his people were the same mess of pottage offered by Mussolini and Hitler to their people. The Falange boasted it would restore the power and glory of Spain under Charles V. The latifundia were to be broken up; Spain was to be industrialized and made self-sufficient; and all Spanish resources were to be mobilized to make Spain the greatest military power that it had ever been. Franco organized the *Hispanidad* movement which worked through the Spanish Foreign Ministry and the Falange on behalf of the Axis and against the interests of the United States¹⁹ and the Allied nations; its principal objective is the restoration of the influence of Spain in Spanish America. It is bitterly hostile to pan-American cooperation.

Franco's task at the end of the civil war was not an easy one. His people were divided not only by that conflict but by ancient intramural animosities. His country had been battered by three years of fighting; the official report on devastated regions put the real-estate loss alone at some \$386,000,000. The transportation system was severely hit. Railroads had lost half their passenger cars, a third of their locomotives, 22 per cent of their freight cars. There was a serious labor shortage, for the war had cost a million men, another million were in jail or in exile, and the need for policing conquered territory made it impossible to demobilize the army. Raw materials were short, and food in what had been the republican zone was nonexistent. The country was in debt to its "saviors," who had used its agony to train their men for the greater struggle they were to start in September, 1939.²⁰

Franco was expected by his friends to handle the reconstruction problem competently, but Thomas Hamilton finds his failures outstanding. Instead of trying to heal the breaches between his people he deepened them. "Seldom in history has a government so deliberately set out to infuriate the conquered." Firing squads were still at work in 1947. Instead of rebuilding he let

¹⁹ On Jan. 5, 1942, Pilar Primo de Rivera, leader of the Falange's women's corps, and sister of the founder of the Falange, decorated the entire Philippines section of the Falange for its fifth-column aid to the Japanese when they landed on the American-held islands. For other details, see Joseph S. Roucek, "Fifth Columns, The Strategy of Treachery, and Total Espionage," Chapter 25, pp. 714-742, in T. V. Kalijarvi, *Modern World Politics* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1942); Allan Chase, *Falange* (New York: Putnam, 1943).

²⁰ See Thomas J. Hamilton, *Appeasement's Child: The Franco Regime in Spain*, p. 131 ff.

the wreckage lie. Instead of carrying out land reforms, tax reforms and irrigation projects which even the monarchy knew were needed, he restored ancient privileges and ancient inequalities. He put education back in the hands of the Church, and almost killed the theatre. With the aid of a bureaucracy famous for its inefficiency he tried to clamp a totalitarian straitjacket on Spain's individualistic economy.

Frictions within the Regime. Franco's regime had more than its share of trouble by the time that two other fascist dictators, Mussolini and Hitler, started tottering. The conflict between private business and Franco's state was bitter. The top army officers were as antagonistic to the Falange as the businessmen. The junta of lieutenant generals who made Franco Chief of State correctly feared that the Falange's expanding power jeopardized their own. After the fall of Mussolini the generals wrote to Franco demanding the restoration of the monarchy. Franco's reply to this maneuver for power was to incorporate some of the leaders of the Falange militia into the army with a rank just below that of the lieutenant generals.

Even the Church began to oppose the Falange. Accustomed for centuries to a position of power in Spain, sometimes equaling that of the state, the Church has been often isolated from the Spanish people. Before the civil war only from 10 to 15 per cent of the Spanish population were active Catholics. Most of the others were indifferent, anti-clerical, or atheist. The Church's support of Franco during the civil war alienated a great many of those who had remained faithful. The Falange has dissolved the Catholic trade unions along with those of the Socialists and Anarchists. The Church's hold upon the young has been loosened through the Falange's youth movements. And, above all, Franco won, after a series of long negotiations with the Vatican, the right to nominate the Spanish bishops. These actions outweigh the things Franco has done for the Church, such as restoration of property and schools to the religious orders and of the state grant to the Church (\$5,800,000 a year). The Catholics began to feel that they were gravely menaced by the Falange. Some 10,000 strongly Catholic Carlists voiced open defiance of the Falangist regime at their annual *banderas* ceremony in April, 1945.

Franco Regime Modified. Realizing the dangerous position in which the Allied victory left his dictatorship, Franco after the collapse of Germany made half-hearted moves to liberalize his

regime in an effort to allay internal opposition. He promised to end the harsh treatment of political prisoners, to curtail political executions, and to restore some civil liberties and freedom of the press. On May 7, 1945, six years after the end of the civil war, he proclaimed a "bill of rights." It allowed freedom of speech, but forbade criticism of the "fundamental principles" of the Falangist State; freedom of assembly, provided it was for "lawful purposes"; and freedom of religious belief, though barring non-Catholics from holding public religious ceremonies.

These and other similar measures failed to satisfy Franco's critics both within and without the regime. Opposition continued to develop. But although a large majority of Spaniards were reported anxious to be rid of Franco and his regime, they were overwhelmingly opposed to another civil war. Many Spaniards looked to the United Nations as the only possible means of overthrowing Franco without bloodshed.

WORLD STAKES IN SPAIN

The Allied military victory over Germany in May, 1945, destroyed the structure of fascism everywhere in Europe except in Spain and Portugal.²¹ Angered by the aid and sympathy which the Franco government extended to the Axis during the war, the peoples of the United Nations were overwhelmingly hostile to the Spanish dictatorship. At the first conference of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945, the delegates voted unanimously to bar Spain from membership in the organization as long as it remained under Franco's rule. The Franco dictatorship was denounced again by the Big Three at the Potsdam Conference in July-August, 1945 and later by the first General Assembly of the United Nations in London. But a split developed between countries led by the United States and Britain on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other over the policy which the United Nations should adopt in seeking to help Spain to oust the dictatorship.

²¹ Spain did not officially mourn the passing of Hitler, but the *New York Herald Tribune* of May 3, 1945, reported that "Falangists wearing party uniforms formed a long line outside the German Embassy (in Madrid) and signed the guest book and left calling cards as a sign of condolence on the death of Hitler. A typical newspaper headline said, 'Adolf Hitler died yesterday afternoon in the Berlin Chancellery fighting to the last moment against Communist forces.'"

Spain's Strategic Importance. The Western democracies were unwilling to support Soviet proposals for forceful intervention in Spain on two grounds. Firstly, they contended that intervention in the internal affairs of Spain was outside the province of the United Nations and would precipitate civil war against the wishes of the Spanish people. Secondly, they feared that Russia planned to utilize such a conflict to gain a foothold in Spain and convert it into a western anchor for a Red Europe. Soviet spokesmen and their supporters, on the other hand, charged Britain and the United States with protecting the Franco regime because of their alleged reactionary sympathies. The truth was that Spain's great strategic significance and its important resources made each side anxious to prevent the other from gaining control.

Spain's influence is felt far beyond her borders. Germany tried to use Spain to influence Latin America. Russia would like to use a semi-Communist Spain for the same purpose. The United States and Britain, therefore, are watching Spain's political trends. Spain and Portugal were the main sources of Germany's tungsten during World War II. Spain's rich copper mines, high-grade iron-ore deposits, mercury mines and big cork forests are only part of the economic stakes in which non-Spaniards invested \$500,000,000 before World War II; Britain owns more than half of this investment. Strategically, Spain's mountains and rivers provide protection for air bases from which planes could range over Western Europe, the Atlantic and the Mediterranean. Deep fiords on the Atlantic coast and Bay of Biscay provide perfect hideaways for submarine and surface raiders. Big guns in Spanish Morocco can close the Straits of Gibraltar as effectively as Gibraltar's own guns. Spain owns the Balearic Islands in the western Mediterranean and the Canary Islands off Africa's northwest coast, both potential air and naval bases.

United Nations Intervention. The Spanish issue remained before the United Nations throughout 1946, without a solution. In February France invited the United States, Britain and Russia to join her in a charge before the United Nations Security Council that the Franco government was a threat to peace which required action by the United Nations. The United States and Britain met this proposal half-way by joining France in a declaration on March 4 branding Franco as a silent partner of the Axis and calling for the peaceful abolition of the Franco regime. Mean-

while the French government proceeded on its own initiative to place an embargo on all travel and economic exchange across the French-Spanish frontier.

At the request of the Russian-dominated Polish delegation, the Security Council of the United Nations conducted an official inquiry into charges that the activities of the Franco regime "have led to international friction and endanger international peace and security." On June 1 the Security Council's subcommittee that made the investigation reported that the Franco dictatorship was a potential, but not an immediate, threat to peace. On the basis of this report the New York session of the United Nations General Assembly in December adopted by a large majority a resolution urging member nations to withdraw their diplomatic representatives from Madrid. This recommendation was followed by virtually all member nations except Argentina. The General Assembly further voted to consider what measures should be taken to remedy the situation if a "government which derives its authority from the consent of the governed" was not established in Spain within a reasonable time.²²

RECENT TRENDS

The desire of the democratic world to do something about Franco's regime should not, however, blind us to the recent trends in world affairs favoring the dictator.

In the first place, Franco is not the ludicrous figure of self-satisfying and self-deluding caricature but a shrewd, inventive, resourceful manipulator who knows how to split the royalist camp, to split the Falange, to play parts of the Church against other parts, generals against each other, and army, Church and party against the others, to take advantage of every least inadvertent error of the democracies.²³ For instance, Franco has played with the Monarchists, and with the Pretender, Don Juan, like a cat with mice. For years he had kept promising a restoration—but, of course, doing nothing. Then, on April 1, 1947, he

²² See "Text of Report on Franco Investigation by the Security Council Subcommittee," *New York Times*, June 2, 1946; Robert Okin, "Spain in the Postwar World," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XXIII: 10 (August 1, 1947), pp. 122-132.

²³ See: E. J. Huges, *Report From Spain* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1947); H. L. Matthews, "Spain Today," *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, XXIV (Winter, 1948), pp. 1-12.

proclaimed the Law of Succession, making himself Chief of State of the Spanish Kingdom, presumably for life, with the right to select his successor. In this respect, Spain is now like the former Hungarian regime, a kingdom without a king; but Franco is more than ever firmly in the saddle, so to speak, if only on the constitutional grounds.

While it is true that an overwhelming majority of the people of Spain dislike the régime, they fear to overthrow it as they do not want another civil war. Thus along with the fear of the masses, Franco's props are provided by the Church, the army, the aristocracy, big business, the police, and the Falange. On the negative side are those fearing another civil war, those who see Communism as the alternative, those who resent outside interference, those who, in a nutshell, will take Franco as the least among a number of worse evils. In this game, Franco is also favored; for Communism needs Franco and Franco needs Communism. In the process of polarization, the vast majority in between, the Socialists and Republicans, will be steadily weakened, for it is they who look to democracy and the West for models and support (and which, materially, is not forthcoming), and it is Franco and the Communists who, though for opposite reasons, wish to make it appear that only Russia is interested in energetic measures against him. Obviously, none of the democratic powers will invade Spain; at the same time, time is against exiles and the underground is weak and divided, and guerrilla fighting has not been too damaging to Franco's system.

All in all, then, Franco is sitting rather firmly on a lid, able to survive in spite of all the unsolved problems. To his credit he claims: minor measures of social security, a little housing, a few public works. But the agrarian problem—a mixture of latifundia and over-small holdings resulting in desperate poverty for the peasant—remains. A series of drought years have added to the shortage of food and housing. While the businessmen did rather well during the war years, plant equipment has been running down and it has been becoming increasingly difficult to import the necessary raw materials. A great monetary inflation, a broken-down transport system, black markets, corruption, inefficiency, and the need to import wheat, meat, sugar, and potatoes (in which Spain is self-sufficient during normal times), and coal, has strained Spain's economy.

On the international scene, while most of the United Nations

were withdrawing their diplomats from Madrid as the request of the United Nations Assembly, Argentina sent an Ambassador—together with Eva Duarte Perón, goods, raw materials, and credits—to Madrid. In fact, by the turn of 1948, all big powers were warming up to Franco; cold war was tending to make him important to the United States, Britain, and Russia; France had her stake in Franco, too. Land, air, and sea power would be able to find bases in Spain in the event of war with Soviet Russia and it is not generally known that the United States still has a stake in Spain's airfields.²⁴

In 1948, Franco's Spain was a totalitarian state, a police state, with a dictator, a single party, a legislature worth not more than a rubber stamp; it was a militaristic, nationalistic, anti-communist, capitalist, conservative, and reactionary regime—but not anti-religious—deifying Franco and not the state. The desperate desire of the Spanish to avoid another civil war and Spain's role to be played in the new rivalry for the control of the Mediterranean favored a few more years of grace to Franco's brand of totalitarianism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BRANDT, J. A., *Toward the New Spain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932). A survey of the development of republicanism in Spain from 1873 to 1931.
- BRENAN, GERALD, *The Spanish Labyrinth* (New York: Macmillan, 1943). A first-rate analysis of the war in Spain, its causes, and some of its fruits.
- FEIS, HERBERT, "Oil for Spain," *Foreign Affairs*, XXVI (January, 1948), pp. 377–388. An important contribution to our knowledge of a critical episode of World War II. Published in an expanded form, as a book, as *The Spanish Story: Franco and the Nations at War* (New York: Knopf, 1948).
- HAMILTON, T. J., *Appeasement's Child: The Franco Regime in Spain* (New York: Knopf, 1943). The baffling cultural and social elements that precipitated the civil war.

²⁴ See: "Friendlier Ties with Spain as Defense Move by West," *United States News and World Report*, XXIV: 5 (January 30, 1948), p. 18. In 1945, the United States and Spain signed an agreement giving the United States the right to fly troops over Spain and land them in Spain on the way to and from the occupied areas; in return, United States Army technicians developed Spain's airfields. The original purpose was to speed up the evacuation of United States troops from Europe.

- HAYES, C. J. H., *Wartime Mission in Spain 1942-1945* (New York: Macmillan, 1945). Hayes, Professor of Modern History at Columbia University, served as American Ambassador in Madrid from 1942 to 1945. His primary assignment was to keep Franco from making any more trouble for us than could be helped. Hayes thinks that he accomplished the mission with real success, despite Axis opposition.
- HUGHES, E. J., *Report from Spain* (New York: Holt, 1947). A condemnation of the Franco regime, by a young Catholic news correspondent who, from August 1942 to May 1946, was press attaché of the American Embassy in Madrid.
- MADARIAGA, SALVADOR, ed., *Spain* (Forest Hills, N. Y.: Transatlantic Arts, 1943). A revision of an earlier history of Spain and an analysis of the past few years.
- MANUEL, F. E., *The Politics of Modern Spain* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938). A well-documented, Leftist interpretation of the entire period of the republic and the decline of the monarchy.
- OLIVEIRA, A. R., *Politics, Economics and Men of Modern Spain, 1808-1946* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1946). The author's thesis is that Spain's tragedy is the lack of a middle class to take over the leadership of society from the degenerate and devitalized aristocracy.
- PLENN, ABEL, *Wind in the Olive Trees* (New York: Boni and Gaer, 1946). Plenn, formerly OWI Chief of Propaganda Analysis attached to the American Embassy in Spain, was in a position to observe the outward panoply of the Falangist machine; an embarrassing commentary on the manner in which the non-interventionist policy of the western democracies aided the 1936 rebellion against the duly constituted republican government.
- QUINTANILLA, LUIS, *Franco's Black Spain* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1946). The visual evidence of the horrors spread throughout the Peninsula by the Moorish mercenaries, with invaluable help from the Nazis and Italians; 40 engravings by the Spanish patriot Luis Quintanilla, with a commentary by Richard Watts, Jr., dwell with terrifying intensity on the atrocities committed by the rebels under Franco and his bully-boys.
- ROBLES, GIL, *Spain in Chains* (New York: American Press, 1937). A bitter condemnation of the Leftist republic.
- The Spanish Book* (Washington, D.C.: Spanish Embassy, Office of Cultural Relations Pubn., 1947). A classified guide to the 1,075 books published in Spain since 1939 and presented through the services of the Cultural Relations Committee, Madrid; index of authors.
- YOUNG, G. Y., *The New Spain* (London: Methuen, 1933). A spirited analysis of the monarchical regime and the early months of the republic of 1931.

PORTUGAL

GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

In World War II Portugal was one of the few remaining neutrals of Europe, the focal point where non-military forces of the Axis and Allied governments came most directly into contact. A connecting link between two worlds—like Turkey in the east—it served as a clearing center for both groups of belligerents. It was the last avenue of escape from western Europe for refugees, and one of the best channels of information from Nazi-occupied countries to the Western Hemisphere.

Once a Pope divided the whole New World between Portugal and Spain. In the 15th and 16th centuries Portuguese explorers, headed by Vasco da Gama, helped to open up the Americas, Africa and Asia, gave their tongue to great Brazil and claimed an empire whose sizable remnant Portugal still rules. But no empire ever had a briefer term of glory. Portugal declined so fast and so far that the rest of Europe and America almost forgot it.

In 1940, for the first time in centuries, Portugal became important to America as the funnel through which poured all the exchanges—of people and messages and diplomacy—between America and Europe. The war, by cutting the lines of intercourse to northern Europe, made Portugal not a faraway corner of Europe but its front door.¹

The frontiers of Portugal are perhaps the least changed frontiers in Europe, and on this little Atlantic oblong, comparable in size and population to Bulgaria, live seven million Portuguese. There is a geographical reason for the difference between Portugal and Spain; the slope of the land away from the center of the Spanish plateau is very marked; as one approaches it from the east by train or by road one runs *down* into Portugal, through green valleys which contrast abruptly with the scorched

¹ "Portugal," *Life*, IX (July 29, 1940), pp. 65-73.

plateau of Spain and which mark very clearly the limits of the Atlantic rainfall. These valleys are very fertile and of great beauty. But the country is undeveloped, living by the export of cork, fish, and wine. The Portuguese have also considerable material riches in cloth; the textiles which were originally woven in the Serra da Estrella have been developed into a modern industry and, in addition, there is a long belt of new ultra-modern factories on the main road running eastward from Lisbon up to the Tagus, which connects with the highway to Spain and to Oporto.

The Portuguese remain to a great extent a simple people, the majority of them being peasants or small proprietors. They are still living in the direct line of an unbroken cultural tradition, including costume, song and dance. As in the case of the other smaller nations of Europe, French culture has been predominant in Portugal.

PORTUGUESE BRAND OF POLITICS

Among the effective forces at work in Portugal today are the State, which means primarily one man—Salazar; the Church; "Big Business"; the relationship with Brazil; and the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance.² Any understanding of the Portuguese politics depends on the proper evaluation of the Portuguese mentality. For example, two words which are very familiar to us, "democracy" and "freedom," are so completely differently understood in Portugal "that their use is a positive danger."³ "Democracy" in Portugal means a state of affairs, such as that prevailing during the early stages of the republic, bordering on complete anarchy. And "freedom" in Portugal means freedom not to be bound by obligations, freedom from restraint, freedom from duties, freedom not to pay debts, and the like.

Portugal was a monarchy for some 700 years. In 1910 a revolution overthrew the Braganzas and a republic came to power. Since 1910 Portugal has witnessed 24 revolutions and *coups d'état*—without much loss of life. The last democratic government was overthrown by a military coup in 1926. Dr. Antonio de

² David Shillan, "Portugal Today," *International Affairs*, XX (April, 1944), pp. 215-224.

³ Shillan, *op. cit.*, p. 216.

Oliveira Salazar became Prime Minister in 1932 and has been virtual dictator of Portugal ever since.

The explanation of Portugal's political history since the early nineteenth century can be found only in its peculiar social and economic structure. Brazil's achievement of independence in 1822 left Portugal with the pressing necessity of reorganizing along new lines its own economic system, hitherto based entirely upon the riches arriving from the distant colony. But Portugal never succeeded in completing the needed reforms, due primarily to the resistance of the old traditional interests enjoying the protection of the monarchy. This created a powerful republican current. A republic was created in 1910, as a result. But the republic did not succeed in solving the old problems, which became increasingly pressing; the democratic aspirations were smothered by a military dictatorship.

Pre-Salazar Political Parties. The development of Portuguese political parties followed much the same course as that of the parties in Spain. A *modus vivendi* between the Conservatives (*Regeneradores*) and the Liberals (*Progressistas*) was established, and the two parties rotated in office with the assistance of the *caciques* (political chiefs). But from about 1890 difficulties of an international and financial character, together with the trend of the crown toward dictatorship, caused the parties to degenerate into personal factions unable to form a stable government or to provide any of the necessary reforms. Republicanism gathered strength with the downfall of the monarchy in Brazil and the increasing radicalism of the urban masses. Unfortunately, the republic, formed in 1910, was unable to provide any solution of the country's economic and political problems. The republican forces disintegrated into factions of which the Democratic Party alone could be termed a party; it was liberal, and represented the middle and lower classes. But it also inherited the secret Carbonari organization, which, frequently guilty of excesses, was used with effect against royalist and radical extremists.

The Constitution of 1911 was republican and democratic, with universal suffrage for males over 21; but the government was as liable to upheavals as the city of Lisbon to earthquakes. The Portuguese Chamber was in a chronic condition of suspension. Thus the republic regime was characterized by intrigues, uprisings and unrest. The state was afflicted with both corrupt politicians and a revolutionary military force. Twice during the period, in

1915 and 1918, rebellious members of the navy bombarded Lisbon. Premier after Premier and Ministry after Ministry were overthrown. In 1921 the Premier was murdered. Finally, in 1926, the republic gave way to a military dictatorship, which brought the state to the verge of bankruptcy and a communistic revolution within two years.

SALAZAR'S DICTATORSHIP

The situation was saved by Dr. Oliveira Salazar who became Minister of Finance in 1928. This Professor of Economics at the University of Coimbra got a first taste of politics in 1926. National finances were chaotic after twenty government changes in five years. He was invited to come to Lisbon to straighten them out. He took a look at the parliamentary confusion and, in deep disgust, demanded a free hand with the Treasury. When this was refused, he caught the next train back to the sedge-lined banks of the Mondego. At the end of two years, continued chaos resolved itself into a government shake-up, and mild, aristocratic General Antonio Oscar de Fragoso Carmona became President. This besashed and epauletted figurehead made Salazar Minister of Finance, with extraordinary powers, which he used to make himself dictator of the nation.

Born at Santa Comba Dão (not far from Europe's second oldest university), in a typical pink-walled Portuguese village, he had made such good marks in grade school that his peasant mother, whom he worshipped, called him "the little priest." He entered a seminary, but later decided he had no aptitude for the priesthood and became an instructor of economics at Coimbra University. Peasant-born and bred, he has the appearance of an over-refined intellectual, but hates—unlike all other modern dictators—parades, pomp or cheers.⁴

On his appointment as Prime Minister Salazar began immediately to construct his Estado Novo. Frequently compared to the totalitarian systems of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany and Falangist Spain, it was emulated by President Getulio Vargas of Brazil. Both men denounced the idea that English parliamentarism and liberalism could be applied to all nations. They believed that

⁴ For more details about Salazar's private life and routine, see "Portugal: How Bad is the Best?" *Time* (July 22, 1946), pp. 28-33.

their respective countries required "a strong regime, based on justice and work."⁵ Both tried to "readjust political machinery to the economic necessities of the country." Guided by a common credo of "family, fatherland, religion," Salazar and Vargas both emphasized the predominantly Catholic background of their nations. They accepted the Church's anti-capitalistic, anti-socialist ideal of a corporative state, and were aiming at social reconstruction in line with the principles set forth in Pope Leo XIII's Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* and Pope Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno*. In neither country did this system prevent continued revolutionary agitation.

Constitutional Set-up. According to the Portuguese Constitution promulgated in 1933, Portugal is a "unitary and corporative" state, meaning that it is an organic whole, organized through "corporations" representing the different phases of its life. This organization "disciplines the national activity in a common harmony of interests," laying as much emphasis on the duties of man as on the rights of man.⁶

Each of the "corporations," the occupational groups which are the component parts of the Estado Novo, is responsible for its own corporate life, like the medieval guilds. Each must protect all those engaged in the branch of activity with which it is concerned, see that all of them are adequately paid for their work, defend their rights, and provide for them in times of misfortune. In Portugal, according to constitutional fiction, there are no upper, middle, or lower classes, but merely persons engaged in the wine industry, the cork industry, the sardine industry, etc. There are associations of employers and of the employed, whose first duty is not to defend class interests but those of the community.

The Party Machinery. The political machinery that keeps Salazar in power is based on the Party of National Union which, in the Portuguese official ideology, is not a party, in the sense in

⁵ For the quotations of the former President of Brazil, Dr. Vargas, see J. F. Normano, *The Economic Ideas of Dr. Getulio Vargas* (Boston: Latin American Economic Institute, 1941), pp. 3, 8-9.

⁶ See Michael Derrick, *The Portugal of Salazar* (New York: Campion, 1939), pp. 63 ff., 108 ff.; S. G. West, *The New Corporative State of Portugal* (Lisbon: Editorial Império, 1937); F. C. C. Egerton, *Salazar* (London: Hodder & Soughton, 1943), develops the thesis that Portugal's history has been remarkably consistent; each age has produced its great leaders and those great leaders are of much the same stamp (Prince Henry the Navigator being an example)—Salazar being the last link in this development.

which we understand the word, but an organization intended to unite men of good will throughout Portugal who subscribe to a particular ideology which has been clearly defined for them.

The government-organized Party of National Union has the task of combatting individualism, socialism and parliamentarianism. Since it is the only political organization permitted, through it Dr. Salazar and his colleagues control elections to the Presidency and the National Assembly and appointments to the Corporative Chamber, which represents local authorities and the various social and economic interests. The Corporative Chamber reports and advises on all bills submitted to the National Assembly. The regime is also supported by the green-shirted Portuguese Legion, a party militia similar to the former Black Shirts of Italy. The elections are used as demonstrations of popular support for the existing regime rather than as a means of choosing governing bodies. Only "educated heads of families" are eligible to vote.

However lofty the original intentions of Salazar, free thought was soon abolished, the individual became subordinated to the state, the bill of rights was suppressed and the secret police became the main arm of government. Soon little boys, well-shod and sporting *Balilla*-like uniforms, were marching in the wake of Salazar's blackshirt-type *Legião* (Legion), which gave the stiff-arm salute and chanted: "Who leads? SALAZAR!"

The Church. The Church is symbolized in the person of the Cardinal Patriarch; the title of Patriarch in itself symbolizes the particular and traditional affection felt by the Holy See for Portugal. The personal relationships between the Cardinal Patriarch and the Prime Minister, owing to their association in the University of Coimbra at the same time, are very close. The State did not attempt to usurp the functions of the Church (as the Nazi and Fascist regimes tried to), which were exercised in the orthodox Roman Catholic spirit and tradition.

"Big Business." A force which received little attention was "Big Business," though it was not "big" in the American sense. The weaving interests and the sardine industry were sufficiently important and well-organized to merit some attention as forces in the country. The peculiar business interest arising from the discovery of wolfram (or tungsten) on Portuguese soil was not so much a question of "Big Business," except in so far as the government was concerned, but it resulted in the creation of

many peasant fortunes, with ludicrous effect, which are frequently satirized in Portuguese revues.

Foreign Relations. During World War II, Salazar, in spite of his anti-democratic tendencies, pursued a serpentine policy whose final tack was enough in the Allies' direction to earn their tolerance, if not their approval. In 1943, Salazar permitted Britain and her allies to use the Azores for naval and air bases. But on Hitler's death, Portugal ordered two days of mourning for Hitler, and flags were flown at half-staff on all public buildings. The German Catholic Church in Lisbon was crowded, as *Time* reported (May 7, 1945), and "many wept when Monsignor Wurzer, the chaplain, spoke of Hitler as a martyr to what he called the knightly fight against the advancing flood of bolshevism." On the other hand, Salazar continued Portugal's alliance with Britain—Europe's oldest alliance, in fact, a mutual aid agreement dating from 1373. Britain has stood as a barrier to attacks on both the homeland and colonial empire of Portugal. In World War II Salazar justified Portugal's neutrality as helping Britain by forestalling German seizure of Portuguese wolfram and other war materials. Portugal's colonial empire, shrunk from its heyday by the loss of Brazil and Oriental areas, is still 26 times larger than the homeland. By far the biggest parcels are Angola and Mozambique in Africa. The Azores and Madeira, Portugal's island groups in the Atlantic, are regarded as an integral part of the republic.

RECENT TRENDS

By 1948, in general, the regime had the support, with distinctly different degrees of enthusiasm, of a broad middle sector of the country's social structure; while the fringe of the monarchists and the liberal-democratic opposition was muttering, together with the Communists, Salazar had little to fear from this opposition.⁷ Once in a while the chronic restlessness burst forth and was helped with gestures of chronic opposition from a section of the armed forces and some leading figures of the academic world (in turn accused of being called Communists). This was evidenced by the revolt of April 10, 1947 when Admiral Cabeçadas had to be dismissed and with him a number of other officers together with twenty-one professors and lecturers. But the regime sur-

⁷ C. W., "Portugal Today," *The World Today*, IV (February, 1948), pp. 74-82.

vived this storm again. By the turn of 1948 it was mainly concerned with the problem of the succession, since President Carmona's term of office was coming to an end. At the same time, the rising cost of living was especially hard on the wage earners and officials in the public services (forced, thus, to hold three or four jobs at the same time in order to make both ends meet). The government inaugurated its eight-year plan of industrialization, the construction of three large dams to release hydroelectric power, and tried to keep the prices in line by importing Argentine meat, Brazilian and American flour, and sugar, potatoes, and fats. These measures made the Minister of Economy, Engineer Daniel Vieira Barbosa, the most popular Minister of the *Estado Novo* among the humbler classes.

That, internationally, Portugal was not without importance to the United States was evident from the fact that General Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Deputy Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, visited Lisbon in February, 1948; and on February 14, 1948, the United States government express its wholehearted appreciation to the Portuguese Government "for its cooperation during and since World War II" on the signing of the air agreement for a lease by the United States of the Lagens airport in the Azores. The Azores had, in fact, served traffic between the New and Old Worlds from the days of sailing ships to the air age; the islands, with a population of nearly 500,000 are ruled as an integral part of Portugal (acquired by Portugal in the 15th century when Portuguese were sailing unknown seas and planting their flag in distant lands).

But economically, Portugal was in a bad shape: the external figures for 1947 showed a deficit of 4,491,424 escudos as compared with 2,272,968 escudos in 1946.

Of all the postwar dictators, Salazar was doing the best. He had his troubles and opposition; but there was little immediate likelihood that he would have to take the road taken by Hitler or Mussolini, or that his seat was the "hot seat" occupied by his neighbor, Generalissimo Franco.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BRAGANÇA-CUNHA, V. DE, *Revolutionary Portugal, 1910-1936* (London: Clarke, 1937). A solid and readable work.

- COTTA, F., *Economic Planning in Corporative Portugal* (London: King, 1937). A scholarly account, favorable to Salazar's regime.
- DERRICK, M., *The Portugal of Salazar* (London: Sands, 1938). A discussion of the government's structure.
- ELLIOTT, A. R., "Portugal: Beleaguered Neutral," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XVII (Dec. 15, 1941), pp. 234-244.
- SALAZAR, OLIVEIRA, *Doctrine and Action* (London: Faber, 1939). Salazar's own statements on the principles of his regime.
- WEST, S., *The New Corporative State of Portugal* (Lisbon: The SPN Books, 1937). An official brief survey.

SWITZERLAND

THE SWISS FEDERAL SYSTEM

The Swiss Confederation under its present constitution has followed a pattern distinctly its own though with full awareness of American constitutional arrangements. The method of distributing power between the cantons and the federal government is analogous to the American federal-state relationship, although the Swiss federal government enjoys, by constitutional grant, considerably more extensive powers than the American. Federal guarantees to the cantons follow the American design. Expansion of the constitution proceeds more democratically, however, because of the use of the constitutional initiative and referendum and the prohibition of the Supreme Court from nullifying constitutional and statutory provisions. On the other hand, the cantons have more power over federal matters than American states through their control over citizenship and federal law enforcement.

Discarding the American idea of separation of powers and checks and balances, the Swiss have preferred a system in which most federal powers are vested in the legislature and the executive and judicial branches of the government are made dependent upon it. Nevertheless, stability in the executive is secured by providing it with a definite term of office. The American idea of a single executive was rejected in favor of a commission composed of heads of departments acting together as a group. Popular participation in government is even greater than in the United States. Though no bill of rights as such is appended to the Swiss Constitution, guarantees of individual rights are as extensive as in this country.

LAND AND PEOPLE

The Swiss Confederation is situated in the mountainous heart of Europe where its people have guarded the high mountain passes for generations against the centripetal pressures of surrounding Great Powers. A small federal State of 15,944 square miles, somewhat less than one-third the size of the American state of Louisiana, one-fourth of which is unproductive and much of the rest is woodland and pasture, the population of 4.2 millions has been unable to achieve self-sufficiency within the borders of the Confederation, yet the Swiss nation has not sought the solution in a policy of *Lebensraum*, at the expense of its neighbors. With a population density of 260 per square mile and lack of coal, metals, petroleum, and other basic economic necessities, Switzerland has been compelled in the interests of a standard of comfortable living for her people to turn from agriculture to industry and trade. At the start of World War II, 45 per cent of Swiss workers were engaged in industry and 28 per cent in agriculture. Ready markets for the precision instruments and other quality products of the highly skilled manpower of the Confederation have been easy to find. Power for the new industries has been supplied by hydroelectric plants utilizing Switzerland's abundant water resources.

Switzerland is a living example of political unity between peoples of diverse languages and cultures. Of the Swiss language groups, 71 per cent speak German, 21 per cent French, 6 per cent Italian, and 1 per cent Romansch. Among the 25 autonomous cantons and half cantons, one (Ticino) speaks predominantly Italian, four predominantly French, and the rest German, except Berne and Fribourg where the language groups are divided. Religious differences have been a source of conflict in the past and traces of it still remain. Catholics are in the minority both in the population (41 per cent) and in the cantons, with five whole and two half cantons owing allegiance to the Roman Church. Adherents of the Protestant faith dominate in the Confederation, being credited with 57 per cent of the population and the remainder of the cantons. Certain of the cantons, however, are either overwhelmingly Protestant or Catholic, while in others both religions coexist.¹

¹ For an excellent general treatment of Switzerland's physical and demographic features, see J. F. Bogardus, *Europe* (New York: Harpers, 1934), Ch. XVII. A briefer

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

Though Switzerland's small size and minor economic importance would under ordinary circumstances hardly warrant its inclusion in a work on comparative governments, certain features of Swiss political development may be considered as original, if not unique, contributions to the science of politics: (1) The Swiss Confederation has demonstrated the fact that political unity and harmony can be accomplished in the presence of great cultural differences in the population, particularly cleavages in language and religion, elsewhere considered insurmountable barriers to the establishment of stable political communities. (2) Swiss federalism has made possible the reconciliation of local self-government and the preservation of distinctive provincial ways of life with strong central government. (3) Switzerland pioneered in the institutions and practices of democracy and still remains the most outstanding example of the democratic attempt to base government in all of its phases upon the will of the people. (4) Another original contribution consists in the development of a variation in the systems of relationship between executive and legislative arms of government wherein the Swiss executive is chosen by, and conforms its policies to, the formally expressed will of the legislature but does not resign office when conflicts between the two branches arise. (5) Finally, Switzerland has shown that a small state may retain its independence and self-respect while maintaining a strict policy of neutrality amidst the power politics and wars of great states raging on all sides.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Beginnings of the Swiss Confederation are traced back to the Perpetual League of 1291, but actually, aside from a league for

statement is given in A. J. Zurcher, "The Political System of Switzerland," J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), pp. 979-983. Recent economic developments are ably handled by E. S. Hediger in his "Switzerland in Wartime," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XVIII (January 1, 1943), pp. 264-269. Considerable space is given to the religious question by R. C. Brooks in his *Civic Training in Switzerland* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), Ch. VII. See also Alfred Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *Suisse, Organisation Politique, Administrative, et Judiciaire de la Confédération Helvétique et de Chaque Canton* (Paris: Sirey, 1936), pp. 33-34.

defense, no real union of the cantons took place until 1778 when French Republican armies invaded the country. The Helvetic Republic, imposed upon the Swiss by the French Directorate, was a unitary state under a national legislature and a commission of five members. Aristocratic privileges were abolished. Certain concessions made to the revolting Swiss in the Act of Mediation of 1803, were unsatisfactory to them. The Congress of Vienna restored the reactionary regimes in the cantons but provided for a National Diet with powers over war and foreign affairs.

A movement in the thirties to democratize cantonal governments and create a stronger union led Catholic cantons to organize the Sonderbund League in opposition. The ensuing civil war resulted in defeat of the Sonderbund, in 1847, and adoption of a new constitution, in 1848. In 1874, a complete constitutional revision was undertaken.²

PRINCIPLES OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION

Though called a Confederation, the allocation by the constitution of large powers to the federal government, and the organization of that government in such a manner as to enable it to operate independently of the cantons, definitely marks the Swiss State as a sovereign entity with a federal form of government.³ The federal distribution of powers was worked out with conscious consideration of the American constitution. As in the United States, the cantons retain all powers not delegated to the federal government. The limited but supreme powers of the Confederation include control over military and foreign affairs, finance, currency, commerce, communications, copyrights, and the supervision of peace and order, the press, and education in the cantons. By the constitutional revision of 1874 and subsequent amendments, the federation acquired ownership of the railways, established monopolies over the manufacture of alcohol and gunpowder, and gained the right to legislate on civil and criminal law, water power and electricity, child labor, social insurance, and other matters. Thus, it may be seen that the powers of the federal

² For details see R. C. Brooks, *Government and Politics of Switzerland* (New York: World Book, 1927), Ch. II.

³ Albert Affolter, *Éléments de Droit Public Suisse* (Berne: K. J. Wyss Erben, 1918), p. 10 ff.

government are broader in many respects than those of the American federal government. The Constitution of the Confederation makes the Federal Assembly the supreme organ of the State subject to the people's will, vests most of the federal powers in it, and makes the executive and judicial branches subservient to it. The federal judiciary is prohibited from exercising judicial review of the Constitution and statutes and any attempts of the Federal Assembly to expand the powers of the federal government may be checked by a popular referendum.

The Confederation guarantees to the cantons their territory, sovereignty, constitutions, liberty and rights of the people, and a republican form of government, provided it is not contrary to the federal constitution. Alliances and treaties of a political nature between cantons or between a canton and a foreign state are forbidden except with the permission of the federal government. Cantons are required to allow free commerce throughout the Confederation, recognize the official acts of other cantons, and concede to citizens of the confederation domiciliary and civil rights. The analogy to the American constitution is clearly rather close. Nevertheless, the cantons, in addition to exercising broad powers over policy and public order, social welfare, public works, local government, elections, education, and many other matters, have control over the acquisition of citizenship, and administer, through cantonal agencies, federal civil and criminal law, federal military regulations, and raise and equip contingents for the federal army, subject to federal supervision.⁴

Popular Sovereignty. In Switzerland, the government is popular not only in name but in fact. All privileges of social rank are abolished and all Swiss citizens are made equal before the law. Legal equality has been interpreted to mean citizens in the same category and the same factual circumstances. Given these conditions no arbitrary exceptions are permitted.⁵ All governmental offices, both national and cantonal, are directly or indirectly subject to the people's vote, and in certain of the smaller cantons institutions of direct democracy are maintained. Constitutional

⁴ The Swiss Constitution is available in German, French, and Italian in *Sammlung der Bundesverfassung und der Kantonsverfassungen* (Berne: Federal Chancellery, 1937). It is available in French in F. R. Dareste and P. Dareste, *Les Constitutions Modernes* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), Vol. II, pp. 544-580. An English translation may be found in C. E. Martin and W. George, *Representative Modern Constitutions* (Los Angeles: Times-Mirror Press, 1923), pp. 36-58.

⁵ Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

amendments and ordinary laws are subject to a popular referendum on both federal and cantonal levels, and, by means of the constitutional and statutory initiative, changes in basic legal patterns on all levels of government can be made by the people themselves.⁶

Individual Rights. Though no bill of rights as such exists in the Swiss Federal Constitution, provisions scattered throughout protect freedom of speech, press, association, religion, petition, domicile, marriage, and equality before the law. In most cases, however, these rights are limited by conferring upon the Confederation and the cantons the power to prevent abuses and impose reasonable regulations. Notwithstanding the guarantees respecting religion, the Order of Jesuits is banned from the Confederation, and the foundation of new convents or religious orders is forbidden. The Confederation, in addition, reserves to itself the right to settle religious controversies between churches, and to legislate regarding maintenance of peace and order between members of different religious communities.⁷

STRUCTURE OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

The Federal Assembly. According to the Constitution the supreme authority of the Confederation is entrusted to the Federal Assembly which consists of two houses—the National Council and the Council of States. An act of October, 1848, designated Berne as the seat of the Federal authorities.⁸

The National Council. The National Council consists of representatives elected from the cantons by the qualified voters (males 20 years of age and over only) on the basis of one for every 22,000 of population, under a system of proportional representation. Cantons and half cantons serve as electoral districts and each is entitled to one representative regardless of its population. The list system of proportional representation is used.⁹

Any qualified voter is eligible to a seat in the National Council. Clerics, officers of the Confederation, and members of the Council of States are excluded. Cantonal legislators, and officials, how-

⁶ Zurcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 987-988.

⁷ Cf. Swiss Constitution, Arts. 49-52.

⁸ Affolter, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

⁹ This is explained in Brooks, *op. cit.*, Ch. XVI.

ever, are eligible. Terms of office are for four years and the tendency is to continue incumbents in office. The effect of proportional representation (adopted in 1919) was to decrease the size of majority party representation and increase that of minority groups—especially the Socialists. The size of the National Council increases with the growth of population but has yet to reach 200 members.

The Council of States. This body was erected on the model of the American Senate with two delegates from each of the full cantons and one from each of the half cantons, with a total of 44 members. The terms, salaries, qualifications, and modes of election of councilors are set by the cantons, thus making the upper house less of a national body than the American Senate. Nevertheless, delegates are forbidden to vote according to instructions of the cantons. No special powers of confirmation of appointments and treaties are given to the Council of States.¹⁰ In all but four of the cantons, members are elected by popular vote. Their terms vary from one to four years.

Organization, Powers, and Procedure. Each house elects a president and vice-president for annual terms. In the case of the National Council, these officers are not eligible for immediate reelection. In the case of the Council of States, a president may not be reelected immediately from the same canton and the vice-president cannot succeed himself. The presiding officers are much less powerful than the American Speaker; they function largely as moderators of proceedings, and cast a deciding vote in case of deadlocks. Deputies of both houses are immune from arrest or prosecution except *in flagrante delicto* without authorization of the Council of which they are members.¹¹

The Federal Assembly is vested with electoral, executive, legislative, and judicial powers. It elects members of the federal executive, federal judges, and the commander-in-chief of the army. It legislates on all matters placed under federal jurisdiction; supervises administration of the laws; submits proposals for amendment of the constitution to the people; decides disputes between federal officials; and issues amnesties and pardons. In exercising its electoral and judicial functions, the Assembly sits as one body,

¹⁰ W. E. Rappard, *The Government of Switzerland* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1936), p. 59.

¹¹ Arts. 78 and 82 of Constitution. See also Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

presided over by the Speaker of the National Council. On all other matters, the two Councils sit and act separately.

Annual sessions are held by both houses and special sessions may be called on request of the Federal Executive, one-fourth of the National Council, or of five cantons. Legislation may be initiated by a Council as a whole, an individual member of a Council, by a canton by correspondence, or by the Federal Executive. In practice, most of the time of the Assembly is taken up with proposals from the Executive. An absolute majority of the whole membership is required in each Council to transact business, and decisions are reached by an absolute majority of those voting. Members of both houses are required to vote without instructions from cantons or voters. Measures submitted by the Federal Council are divided equally between the two houses by their presidents and referred to committees organized to represent party strength approximately as it is in each house. In case of disagreement over a bill, each house may reconsider its action, or the bill may be referred to a joint committee to iron out differences. The two houses are coequal in power except that in the Federal Assembly the National Council greatly outnumbers the Council of States. All official documents are printed in the four languages, and speeches in parliament are translated from one language to another.¹²

THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

Instead of a single executive with highly concentrated powers, as in the American constitutional system, the Swiss put their trust in an executive in commission. The form differs from the type evolved in British constitutional practice in that there is no actual executive with great power and influence such as the British Prime Minister and no monarchical or quasi-monarchical institutions are present. The Swiss executive resembles more closely the commission form of government prevalent in certain American municipalities. The Federal Council, as the Swiss executive is called, is a plural body composed of seven members, elected by the Federal Assembly for a term of four years. The terms of the Federal Council and National Council are made to coincide.

¹² For additional material on this section, see Constitution, Arts. 84-94; Affolter, *op. cit.*, p. 107; Zurcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 990-993, and James Bryce, *Modern Democracies* (New York: Macmillan, 1921), Vol. I, pp. 344-351.

Every year the Federal Assembly chooses a president and vice-president of the Council. The president of the Federal Council is also president of the Confederation. In the latter capacity, the president may make decisions in the name of the Federal Council in case of emergency and exercises general supervision over federal administration.¹³

Other duties involve serving as head of the nation in ceremonial functions and acting as chairman of the Council. It is clear, therefore, that the actual executive powers are exercised by the Council as a whole except in so far as the president is able to influence the Council in his capacity as presiding officer, or in case of emergency. Reelection of president and vice-president for the following year is forbidden, but they may be reelected later. The practice is to elevate the vice-president to the presidency. Every member of the council gets his turn as president according to his seniority on the council.¹⁴

Any person eligible to the National Council is qualified to be elected to the Federal Council. By usage, only one member can be elected from any one canton. Berne and Zurich, as the most populous, always have one each; Vaud, as the largest French-speaking canton, always has one; and one is also often chosen from Ticino, principal Italian-speaking canton. Custom prescribes that not more than five shall come from German-speaking cantons. Councilors may not hold any other remunerative position while in office. They are paid about \$10,000 per year in salary. At least four members must be present for the transaction of business.

The powers of the Council cover usual executive matters, such as direction of administration, enforcement of the Constitution and laws, control over foreign, military, and internal security affairs, some powers of appointment and removal, and protection of the canton against domestic violence, or invasion. Each member of the Council is head of a department of administration. Matters of detail relating to individual departments are dealt with by the department head, but matters of general policy are considered in the Council as a whole.¹⁵

Relation to the Legislature. In theory, the Federal Council is

¹³ Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

¹⁴ Cf. Rappard, *op. cit.*, p. 76; and D. deRougemont and C. Muret, *The Heart of Europe* (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1941), pp. 43, 84-85.

¹⁵ For a detailed itemization of their powers, see Constitution, Art. 102.

entirely dependent upon the legislature. It is elected by the legislature; its measures must have the approval of the chambers; and its policies are subject to their continuous scrutiny. There is no power of dissolution as in Great Britain. The Council is frequently called upon to draft legislation desired by the legislature. Its members have the right to appear and speak in both chambers but have no vote. They cannot be members of the legislature. If measures proposed by them are rejected by the Federal Assembly, they do not resign but merely change their policies to conform to the legislative will. Membership of the Federal Council does not exactly conform to party strength in the National Council. The Swiss practice is to reelect members of the Federal Executive for as long as they wish to remain in office. Hence, its members cannot necessarily depend upon support of a majority coalition for their policies.

Yet, in practice, the Swiss executive exercises a controlling influence on legislative affairs. Some of the reasons for this are: (1) the long experience and tenure of office of its members; (2) their virtual monopoly over the drafting and initiation of legislation; (3) superior knowledge of the legislation under consideration; and (4) guidance of bills by councilors and their expert advisers through the Houses. Recent developments have increased the dominance of the Federal Council. Plenary powers conferred on the executive during World War I were whittled down after the war, but the depression of the thirties necessitated additional grants. When World War II broke out, unlimited powers were again given to the Federal Council. The use of decree powers has been on the increase. By the mere process of accretion, some additional authority is apt to remain.¹⁶

ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIL SERVICE

The seven departments of federal administration include the Departments of Political Affairs, Military Affairs, Justice and Police, Finance and Customs, Interior, Posts and Railways, and National Economy. All agencies of federal administration are grouped under these categories. Heads of departments may remain in charge for an indefinite period. For example, Giuseppe

¹⁶ Hediger, *op. cit.*, p. 269; and Zurcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 995-996.

Motta was head of the Political Department (Foreign Affairs) for twenty years.

The number of Swiss civil servants is greater in proportion to her total population than in the United States.¹⁷ This is due in the main to federal operation of Swiss railways and monopolies. Most public employees are appointed within the various departments under rules of the Federal Council which fix qualifications, salaries, and conditions of service. Though not all are subjected to written examinations, it is generally agreed that their performance is, on the whole, efficient, and corruption is notably absent. Wages are low, but this is offset by security of tenure and adequate pensions. Federal employees are organized into unions which exercise great influence on politics. Strikes are prohibited, but other measures of self-protection can be utilized. Government workers are widely represented in national and local legislatures.¹⁸

THE FEDERAL TRIBUNAL

The Swiss Federal Tribunal is not on a comparable level of importance with the United States Supreme Court because it lacks the power of the latter to nullify acts of the legislature; its jurisdiction is less comprehensive; and it does not preside over a system of federal courts. Created by the constitutional revision of 1874, the Tribunal was located at Lausanne in French-speaking Switzerland. Its organization, size, terms, and salaries are determined by constitutional and statutory provisions. The 26 to 28 members are elected by the Federal Assembly for six-year terms and the practice is to reelect them for as long as they wish to serve. Any person eligible to the National Council is qualified for the Court, but, in practice, only highly trained lawyers are chosen. Care is taken to have different sectional and language groups represented on the Court. The president and vice-president are elected for two-year terms by the Federal Assembly but cannot be reelected to succeed themselves. The judges receive salaries of about \$5,000 per year.

The tribunal is expressly prohibited by the Constitution from declaring acts of the Federal Assembly unconstitutional but can review laws enacted by cantonal authorities. Its jurisdiction ex-

¹⁷ Brooks, *Civic Training in Switzerland*, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* pp. 132-137.

tends in civil suits to cases between the Confederation and cantons, or citizens; cases between cantons, between cantons and citizens where federal matters are involved; between communes and citizens in matters involving citizenship; and to other matters determined by federal law. Criminal jurisdiction of the Tribunal covers cases of high treason, crimes against the laws of nations, and political crimes in situations involving federal intervention. In administrative cases, the Court deals with constitutional and treaty questions and conflicts of federal and cantonal authorities. For dealing with civil suits, the Tribunal is divided into three sections. Two sections specialize on civil cases, and one section handles matters of public law. Organization of the Court for criminal suits includes four sections: (1) an indictment chamber, (2) a criminal chamber (assize court), (3) a federal penal court; and (4) a court of cassation. For convenience in the handling of cases, territory of the Confederation is divided into three districts. The twelve jurors attached to the criminal court are elected by the people for six-year terms. A Procurer-General, under direction of the Federal Council, supervises activities of the judicial police and acts as prosecutor before the Federal Tribunal. There are no inferior federal courts. Most cases involving federal laws are adjudicated by cantonal courts.¹⁹

LAWMAKING BY THE PEOPLE

In Switzerland, the people either make the laws themselves or have a check on those made by their representatives. In the five *Landsgemeinde* cantons, the laws are made by the people directly, in annual meetings where all male citizens attend and vote. These are probably the most democratic political gatherings in the world where government comes as close to the people as is humanly possible.²⁰

The Constitutional Initiative. In the Confederation as a whole, either single amendments or a complete revision of the Constitution may be proposed by 50,000 voters. If complete revision is demanded, the proposition is submitted to a popular vote. If favorable, the two Councils are elected anew and proceed to re-

¹⁹ Cf. Constitution, Arts. 107-114; Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-73; and Affolter, *op. cit.*, p. 154 ff.

²⁰ R. C. Brooks, *op. cit.*, Ch. XVII.

wise the constitution. The total revision is then submitted to a vote of the people and of the cantons. In case of a request for partial revision, if it is in general terms, the Federal Assembly draws up the revision as indicated in the petition and refers it to a vote of the people and of the cantons unless the Assembly opposes the proposition, in which case it submits the question to the people. If the people approve, it proceeds as indicated above. Single proposals, if in definite form, are submitted to the voters and become law if approved by a majority of those voting and a majority of the cantons. Alternative measures may be submitted by the Federal Assembly at the same election. The statutory initiative is not in effect in the Confederation but exists in most of the cantons.²¹

The Referendum. The federal Constitution provides for both the compulsory constitutional referendum, and the optional, statutory referendum. Constitutional amendments approved in the Assembly by an ordinary majority vote are automatically submitted to the electorate. If approved by a majority of those voting and a majority of the cantons, they become part of the Constitution. If only one house approves, two popular elections are held, one to approve the desirability of the proposition, the other to adopt it.

The optional referendum applies to ordinary legislation. Petitions bearing 30,000 signatures, or on request of eight cantons, can compel submission to the voters of any laws, except those of an emergency character. A majority of the voters, only, is required to defeat such measures. Similar provisions exist in most of the cantons.

The record shows that popular lawmaking is on the increase. The tendency is to accept more of the proposals coming from the legislature than those originating by popular initiative. The optional referendum has been a very effective check on the legislature in Switzerland. There is an inclination to adopt rejected measures after several submissions. Radical propositions are invariably turned down by the voters without prejudice against their sponsors. Patriotic measures are very popular and social reform legislation is gaining increasing favor. Taken as a whole, the judgment of the voters is shrewd, conservative, and well-balanced.²²

²¹ Cf. Constitution, Arts. 118-123.

²² Rappard, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-75.

GOVERNMENT IN THE CANTONS

The Swiss cantons resemble American states in the sense that their sovereign autonomy is guaranteed by the Constitution, and each is possessed of a constitution and government of its own with broad authority over its internal affairs. Differences in the cantons are even greater than in American states. They vary greatly, not only in size, but in race, language, religion, and local culture. Federal control over the cantons resembles the American system, also, in that the Federal government is required to see to it that cantons maintain a republican form of government—defined as representative or democratic—and have constitutions not inconsistent with the federal Constitution, adopted and capable of being amended by the people. There is a tendency, however, to centralize more and more power in the federation. Federal authorities exercise supervision over education, child labor, industrial conditions, social security, civil and criminal law, and other matters, and, through subsidies are broadening the scope of their control over cantonal affairs.

Landsgemeinde Cantons. Five of the twenty-five cantons and half cantons are pure democracies, governed by annual meetings of the voters in some central place. Everyday business is managed by an executive commission, elected by the voters, and headed by a Landamman, or president. The Landamman is chosen for one year, but in practice, is reelected as often as he wishes to serve. Advisory councils pass on proposed legislation submitted by the voters.

Representative Cantons. The other twenty cantons and half cantons are representative democracies. Cantonal legislatures are unicameral bodies, called Great Councils. Their members are chosen for terms varying from one to four years from small districts, by proportional representation in most cases. They vary in size from about thirty members to over two hundred in the larger cantons. Lawyers do not predominate in the membership as in the United States.

The cantonal executive consists of a commission, called the Council of State, ranging in size from five to eleven members and chosen by the voters. Cantonal governments function in a manner similar to the Federal government.

Courts of the Cantons. Cantonal Courts include: (1) Cantonal Tribunals (Courts of Cassation), elected in most instances by

the cantonal legislature, and devoting their attention primarily to hearing appeals on points of civil and criminal law; (2) Tribunals of First Instance (District Courts), handling important civil and criminal cases; and (3) Inferior Tribunals (Justice of the Peace or Magistrates Courts) which deal with minor civil suits and misdemeanors. Civil and criminal cases in the higher courts are heard in separate chambers. In all except Inferior Tribunals, the system of plural judges is the rule. District and local courts are elected in most cantons by the people. A number of special courts are instituted such as Commerce Courts to settle business disputes, Conciliation Courts, Insurance Courts, and Juvenile Courts. As in the case of France and other continental countries, Administrative Courts are set up to take jurisdiction over suits against public officials and the state. Both judges and attorneys are required to pursue difficult courses of study at the universities and then take rigid examinations before special boards.²³

The Communes. Switzerland, like France, is divided into political communes, ranging from small rural areas to large cities. These areas are governed by town meetings in the smaller places and by councils and executive boards in the larger communes. Swiss cities are notable for their efficient management. There are over 3,000 political communes in Switzerland.

POLITICAL PARTIES

Principal parties in Switzerland today include the Liberal Democrats, Radical Democrats, Catholic Conservatives, Social Democrats, and the Farmers', Workers', and Burghers' Party. The first two are the historical parties. They engineered the social and political reforms which produced the Swiss political system of today. They stand largely on their record, on liberalism, and the maintenance of the present regime, although left-wingers have evidenced a tendency towards more radical social and economic reforms recently. The Catholic Conservatives are the party of the Catholic Church and stand on its platform of opposition to socialism. They defend private property but advocate amelioration of the condition of the poor. They are opposed to federal centralization because the Catholic cantons are in the minority.

The Social Democrats are socialists of the Marxian type but

²³ Cf. Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-95.

are moderate and evolutionary in their policies. They want government ownership and operation of the means of production and a system of national planning but desire to achieve their reforms by democratic processes. The Farmers', Workers', and Burghers' Party is supported almost exclusively by the peasants. It seeks higher prices for farm goods, and farm subsidies.

Since 1919, when proportional representation was introduced, the traditional parties have lost majority control in the National Council. The Socialists, on the other hand, have gained steadily until, in 1943, they secured 56 seats in that body to 47 for the Radicals, 43 for the Catholics, and 22 for the Farmers and Workers. Thus, under the impact of war, they have become the largest party in the lower house. Yet, in 1947 they had only one representative on the Federal Council to three for the Radicals, two Catholics, and one Farmer-Worker.²⁴

The national organization of the parties is less highly integrated than in America. Representative Diets discuss national policies but do not nominate candidates. Central executive committees exist to manage party business. The most vital party activities are carried on in cantonal and local party organizations where nominations are made and money raised to carry on election campaigns. Political parties in Switzerland engage in educational and physical training activities on a wide scale in order to try to attract members.²⁵

THE SWISS ARMY

Switzerland has the most democratically organized army in the world. Conscripted at nineteen, the recruit is given about three months of intensive training; then he is sent home with his uniform and arms. From then on until his forty-eighth year he is called up annually for two weeks of field exercises. Membership in rifle clubs enables him to improve his marksmanship. Conscripts are given examinations on reporting for duty and the most competent are selected for officer's training. There is no standing army. The highest rank in the service is that of colonel, except in time of war, when the Federal Assembly selects a commanding general. War plans are made in the Department of Military Af-

²⁴ *Political Handbook of the World* (New York: Harpers, 1946), p. 168.

²⁵ Brooks, *op. cit.*, Ch. IV.

fairs. Conscripts rejected for physical defects are required to pay a property and income tax.²⁶

WARTIME DEVELOPMENTS

Political Affairs. On the outbreak of war in 1939, the Swiss government ordered mobilization of its army of 500,000 men, and kept it mobilized throughout the war, though some units were sent home after the defeat of France. Henry Guisan was elected Commander-in-Chief of the Swiss army. The fall of France enabled Axis powers to surround Switzerland completely and gave them control over all movement of goods and persons across Swiss borders. Invasion of the country was expected momentarily. The well-armed Swiss were prepared to destroy all bridges and roads leading into Switzerland, blow up the Simplon and St. Gothard tunnels which give Germany access to Italy, and take their stand in the high mountains.²⁷

The Nazi press began a campaign against Swiss newspaper attacks on the Fuehrer State. The German minister to Switzerland demanded curbs on press criticisms of the Nazis, forced the Swiss to cooperate in production of war goods and foodstuffs for Germany, and encouraged fascist groups in Switzerland.²⁸

The Federal Assembly adopted measures to curb foreign agents, parties, groups, and publications. Foreigners were compelled to register. Unlimited powers were conferred on the Federal Council to deal with the war emergency. By decree, Communist and Fascist parties were outlawed. Some censorship was imposed on the press. Nazi demands for demobilization of the army and removal of restrictions on fascist groups were refused. Despite fear of invasion and the heavy burdens imposed by the war, Switzerland maintained her middle-class, democratic institutions practically intact. Labor unions and the socialists supported the government. Fascist parties, such as the "National Front," lost influence with the people.²⁹

²⁶ Hediger, *op. cit.*, p. 262. For details regarding organization of the army and steps taken for defense against air attacks, see Silbernagel-Caloyanni, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-21.

²⁷ E. J. Byng, "If Switzerland Is Invaded," *American Mercury*, LVIII (April, 1944), pp. 488-491.

²⁸ Charles Lannis, "Switzerland, Axis Captive," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXV (January 23, 1943), pp. 24-25.

²⁹ "Swiss Fascist Fronts," *Living Age*, CCCLIX (September, 1940), p. 9.

SWISS NEUTRALITY

Originated in 1648, the policy of neutrality has become a fixed aim of the Confederation. So basic to their purposes was this considered by the Swiss people that, in 1920, the government refused to enter the League of Nations unless relieved of the obligation to participate in military sanctions against aggressor states or to allow passage of foreign troops across its territory. Only when this right was granted did the Confederation, after having submitted the question to a popular vote, enter the League. In 1939, so determined were the Swiss to maintain their neutrality that the League of Nations was given notice that it might be forced to leave Geneva on twenty-four hours' notice. With iron determination, the Republic maintained its neutrality throughout the war. In spite of being forced to muzzle the press, institute black-outs, and make economic concessions to Germany, Switzerland stood ready to fight rather than yield her independence. Strangely enough, though Swiss neutrality has been a policy of peace, the Confederation now found itself barred for a time from entry into the United Nations organization because membership was reserved for those who had declared war against the Axis.³⁰

Economic Conditions. After June, 1940, Swiss external trade could be carried on only on German terms. As a result, Switzerland was compelled to employ most of her factories and manpower in producing goods and foodstuffs for the Reich. Her railroads, also, were devoted almost entirely to carrying goods between Germany and Italy. As a result, exports did not fare badly, but imports dropped sharply in volume. German price manipulations worked to Swiss disadvantage. Rationing was instituted but allowances were liberal compared to other European countries. The Wahlen Plan for increasing food production and making provisions for work projects was activated with very satisfactory results. By the end of 1943, 140,000 acres had been added to the total of cultivated land. However, total available

³⁰ Cf. M. Moos, "Swiss Neutrality," *Yale Review*, XXXIII (September, 1943), pp. 121-134; D. deRougmont and C. Muret, *op. cit.*, Ch. X; and "Switzerland's Wartime and Post-War Policy," *Bulletin of International News*, XXII (April 14, 1945), pp. 343-344.

arable land in Switzerland is not sufficient to meet her entire needs in foodstuffs. Nevertheless, despite a shortage of meats and grains, strict rationing permitted maintenance of a fairly satisfactory diet.

SWITZERLAND IN THE POSTWAR WORLD

Effects of the War. It has been Switzerland's fortune to emerge from the war bearing comparatively few scars. Aside from a greatly expanded war debt and a problem of economic readjustment in shifting away from production of war goods for Germany to peacetime production with greater dependence upon the Allies, the Helvetian Republic entered the postwar period with its prewar institutions substantially intact. Unlike the other small powers of central Europe, the Swiss were able to escape occupation by Axis powers. Fifth column penetration was kept within narrow limits and Swiss democratic ideology was little affected thereby. The great value of the traditional Swiss policy of neutrality was once again demonstrated in that, thanks to its effectiveness, the Swiss people were enabled to escape the ravages of war and enter the postwar period with stable political institutions and a fair degree of prosperity. How was this possible? The best explanation seems to be that the Swiss government and people demonstrated sound judgment and strong nerves in their dealings with Germany. They made the minimum compromises dictated by their isolated position, yet stood ready with their well-organized army and defensive positions to fight to the death against any infringement of their independence. Moreover Swiss neutrality was useful to both Axis and Allied powers in providing them with a conveniently located observation and espionage center. Switzerland's role as a Protecting Power for the nations on both sides of the conflict and as center of operations for the International Red Cross also made possible essential communications between the belligerents regarding the care and exchange of war prisoners.⁸¹ Yet in the final analysis Swiss independence was preserved only through the victory of the Allies, which the Swiss did little to assist.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

RELATIONS WITH THE ALLIES

Swiss public opinion, except for a brief period of pessimism after the defeat of France in 1940, was whole-heartedly pro-Allied. Economic collaboration with Germany was reluctantly entered upon as a matter of necessity, because Swiss access to the other markets of the world was cut off by the fall of France. Berne, with true Helvetic stubbornness, was not slow to point out the conformity of its Axis trade with the principles of international law. Nevertheless, members of the United Nations did not hesitate to express their vigorous opposition. Critics in the Soviet and American press throughout the war accused Switzerland of being pro-Nazi. On November 7, 1944, the U.S.S.R., irritated by Berne's refusal after the 1917 revolution to recognize the new Communist regime and provoked by the ban on the Communist Party in Switzerland and Swiss aid to Germany, refused to renew diplomatic relations.

In the spring of 1944, the Anglo-American Allies protested Switzerland's activities in aiding Germany's war industry and, after the Allied invasion of Europe decreased the danger of Nazi reprisals against the Swiss, redoubled their demands that the Republic stop working for Germany. By the end of September, 1944, the government of the Confederation had placed a ban on the export of all war materials (except precision instruments) to all belligerents and greatly reduced war traffic going from Germany to Italy. Through necessity, some trade continued with Germany because transportation difficulties and military operations in France prevented equivalent amounts of goods from reaching Switzerland from the United States.⁸² Finally, in March, 1945, the Berne government concluded an agreement with an Allied military mission under which the Confederation pledged itself to stop all military production for Germany and prevent escape into Switzerland of German funds.

Switzerland agreed to (1) freeze all German assets in Switzerland, including those held through Swiss nationals; (2) prohibit importation, exportation, and dealing in all foreign currencies, and restrict Swiss purchases of gold in Germany, and prevent escape of German assets into Switzerland in the future; (3) completely stop shipments of coal to Northern Italy across Switzerland; (4) reduce Swiss exports to Germany to fractional quanti-

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 348.

ties; (5) ban exports of electricity to Germany; and (6) make agreements with France to divert surplus electric power and goods to that country.³³

In the summer of 1946, the Swiss, under pressure from the Allies, agreed to yield one-half of all German assets in Switzerland to an Inter-Allied Reparations Agency for use in rehabilitation of areas devastated by the German occupation.³⁴ Fearful of losing her independence and of departing from her traditional policy of neutrality by entering the United Nations and accepting its obligations to take forceful action against peace-breakers, the Swiss government refused to accept membership unless special provision was made recognizing its right to remain neutral. Swiss representatives attacked the organization of the Supreme Council which made the great powers dominant in the UN and urged amendment of the Charter to permit creation of a truly representative federal system comparable to the Swiss model.³⁵

RECENT TRENDS

Political Developments. Despite the extension of Communism over eastern and much of central Europe, Switzerland has maintained a middle-of-the-road policy since the war, holding in check threats to her democratic institutions from both extreme right and extreme left. National elections, held in October 1947, indicated little change in popular attitudes. The Social Democratic Party lost representation in Parliament, dropping from 55 to 48 seats. The Liberal Democrats jumped from 47 to 51 seats. Catholic Conservatives gained two (43 to 45 seats), the Peasants, Bourgeois, and Artisans Party lost one seat (22 to 21), the Independent Party gained two (6 to 8), the Communists increased their strength from 1 to 7 seats, while the non-party seats dropped from 20 to 14. The center parties thus continued to dominate the situation while the Communist threat failed to materialize. Both

³³ Cf. "Results of Economic Negotiations with Switzerland," *Department of State Bulletin*, XII (April 8, 1945), p. 601.

³⁴ A. Comstock, "German Assets in Switzerland," *Current History*, N.S. XI (August, 1946), pp. 89-93.

³⁵ W. E. Rappard, "The United Nations and Switzerland," *Annals*, CCXLVI (July, 1946), pp. 64-71; D. deRougemont, "The Idea of a Federation," *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XVII (Autumn, 1941), pp. 491-501; and M. W. Wilson, "The Swiss Model for Europe," *Contemporary Review*, CLXII (August, 1942), pp. 102-106.

the President and Vice-President were drawn from the Catholic Conservative Party.³⁶

The Question of Centralization. The transfer of considerable blocks of power during the war from the Cantons to the National Parliament and from Parliament to the Executive, together with the unprecedented use of executive decrees, raised the question at the end of the war of whether Switzerland should return these powers to the Cantons, reverting to the old policy of decentralization and laissez-faire, or whether they should be retained by the National Government and used to promote national planning and social reform. Socialists and other leftist groups advocated the latter plan, but their stand was balanced by strong opposition from the conservative side.

A referendum held on July 6, 1947 to vote on several new amendments to the constitution, repealing emergency war powers and conferring upon the Government authority to intervene in the national economy to protect agriculture, labor and various branches of industry from competition from foreign cartels, and promote efficiency and national welfare, was carried by a narrow majority (558,000 to 496,000 of the popular vote and 13 to 9 of the cantons). The restrained character of the new law is shown by the popular rejection of previous referenda of May 1946, on the "right to work," and the requirement in the new constitutional provision that any decision taken by the Government must accord with the will of the people as ascertained through federal laws subject to a popular referendum. Thus Switzerland did not revert to the prewar system, but its progress toward centralization was slow and moderate.³⁷

Meanwhile, Switzerland remained by far the most prosperous country in Europe. Though there were evidences of inflation and the cost of living had risen 59 per cent above 1939, yet consumer goods of all kinds were abundant and seemingly not beyond reach of the average citizen. Nevertheless shortages in fuel and raw materials still continued. Increasing swarms of tourists fed the streams of income coming to the Swiss people from abroad. Apparently secure from foreign attack in their high mountains, the Swiss resumed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union

³⁶ Irving D. W. Talmadge, "Switzerland: Europe's Shangri-La," *Current History*, XIV:77 (January 1948), pp. 32-35.

³⁷ "The Extension of State Control in Switzerland," *The World Today*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, III:11 (November 1947), pp. 501-506.

during 1947, but jealously guarded their independence from the possibility of a Communist *coup d'état*. At the same time, however, Switzerland was moving toward the retention and extension of the state controls of the country's economy introduced during World War II. The referendum on this question, of July 6, 1947, on the question of the introduction into the Constitution of several new economic articles, approved thus by a narrow majority.³³

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AFFOLTER, ALBERT, *Eléments de Droit Public Suisse* (Berne: K. J. Wyss Erben, 1918). An excellent commentary on the Swiss constitution.
- BROOKS, R. C., *Government and Politics of Switzerland* (New York: World Book, 1927). The standard American textbook on Switzerland up to 1936; *Civic Training in Switzerland* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930). Contains much interesting material on political parties, education, the army, civic groups, and other aspects of Swiss political life.
- BRYCE, JAMES, *Modern Democracies* (New York: Macmillan, 1921). Too well known to require comment.
- DARESTE, F. R., and DARESTE, P., *Les Constitutions Modernes* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), Vol. II. Contains the Swiss constitution in French.
- DEROUEMONT, D., and MURET, C., *The Heart of Europe* (New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce, 1941). Places special emphasis on the Swiss environment and character traits. Excellent literary style.
- HUBER, H., *How Switzerland Is Governed* (Zurich, Switzerland: Schweitzer Spiegel Verlag, 1946). Excellent treatment from an on-the-spot observer.
- KERN, W. M., *Switzerland Today* (London: Heineman, 1945). Brief but to the point.
- MARTIN, C. E., and GEORGE, W. H., *Representative Modern Constitutions* (Los Angeles: Times-Mirror Press, 1923), pp. 36-58. This book has a translation of the Swiss constitution in English.
- RAPPARD, W. E., *The Government of Switzerland* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1936). An excellent interpretive textbook by a very competent Swiss writer.
- Sammlung der Bundesverfassung und der Kantonsverfassungen* (Berne: Federal Chancellery, 1937). Contains the Swiss federal and cantonal constitutions in German, French, and Italian.

³³ T. F., "The Extension of State Control in Switzerland," *The World Today*, III (November, 1947), pp. 501-506.

SILBERNAGEL-CALOYANNI, ALFRED, *Suisse, Organization Politique, Administrative, et Judiciaire de la Confédération Helvétique et de Chaque Canton* (Paris: Sirey, 1936). Brief but full of valuable material on various aspects of Swiss government—federal and cantonal.

ZURCHER, A. J., "The Political System of Switzerland," J. T. Shotwell, et al., *Governments of Continental Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1940). Very competent and a fairly up-to-date extensive treatment of the government of Switzerland.

SCANDINAVIAN NATIONS AND FINLAND

Scandinavian governments are typically European in that they are parliamentary democracies, regardless of their monarchical or presidential form. Like the British and American governments they are true democracies in that the voice of the people, freely expressed at the polls, is the final power in the state. Like the British government, each Scandinavian government is headed by a premier and a cabinet which must command parliamentary confidence in order to continue its existence.

Perhaps nowhere in the world has the social role of government been so widely accepted and developed while still preserving free enterprise including most of the forms of enlightened capitalism. Many of the parties are organized on a socio-political basis, unlike American and British political parties. The cooperative movement has been made a responsibility of central government and has been injected into practically all phases of life. This is something which the Anglo-Saxon peoples have only begun to develop in Australia and New Zealand.

In spite of many dissimilarities the Anglo-Saxon governments have more in common with Scandinavian political institutions and concepts than they do with any of the other European governments.

GEOPOLITICS

Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, located in northern Europe and once combined into the most powerful state on that continent, have much the same background of history and culture. Their total population is about 17,000,000 people related in race and language except for the Finns (Finno-Ugrians) and the Laplanders. The common religion is Lutheran, and education and culture are well advanced. The combined military

strength of these states might be between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000.

All four countries run north and south. The terrain is varied and ranges from the flat rolling morain of Finland or the sandy stretches of Denmark to the towering mountains of Sweden and Norway with their deep fjords and precipices. All lie around the Baltic Sea with the exception of Norway, which faces the North Sea.

From the standpoint of government they have been one of the most successful testing grounds for democratic principles. Three of the governments are constitutional monarchies and one a parliamentary democracy. The Scandinavians have a deep respect for freedom and a fine sense of social responsibility, and because of necessity they have developed cooperatives of all sorts to a highly advanced stage, voluntary cooperatives being regulated by the governments. During recent times the four states have been subject to the pressures of England, Germany, France and Russia.¹

SWEDEN

*The Geopolitical Aspects of Sweden.*² Sweden is the largest country as to size, number of people, and richness of natural resources. Stretching approximately 1,000 miles north and south, it is a little over 300 miles wide, and covers an area of a little less than 175,000 square miles. The surface is mountainous in the northwest gradually leveling out to the south and the east. It is a land of lakes, rivers and towering mountain falls. The mountains are occasionally intersected by passes which form easy channels of communication through Norway and to its harbors. Sweden, therefore, has become a transit area from the North Sea and the North Atlantic on the one hand to the Russo-Finnish continental territory on the other. Like most of Scandinavia, Sweden generally enjoys a favorable climate, because the Gulf Stream hugs the coast and gives protection against the cold of the north. Its fairhaired, tall, blue-eyed people number 7,000,000, located chiefly in the eastern and southern halves of the country.

Rich deposits of iron are found particularly in the district of

¹ See Lionel W. Lyde, *The Continent of Europe* (London: Macmillan, 1924), Chs. 12, 19, 24.

² *Ibid.* p. 12.

Berglagen in central Sweden, and in Lapland. Here are the famous Kirunavaara and Gellivara mines, which were widely publicized at the beginning of World War II. Sweden also has a vast supply of constant water power, one-third of which is owned by the state and two-thirds by municipalities and private concerns. Coal occurs in small deposits, particularly in Skåne, and in addition there are granite, potash, limestone, bituminous shale and peat deposits. Forestry resources are vast and regulated by excellent legislation as well as being cared for by the most advanced forest management and forestry methods. Agriculture is varied, producing grain, peas, beans, potatoes, sugar beets, fodder, fruits, livestock and dairy products. Industry too is excellent, including activities in the fields of mining, machines, electrotechnical work, timber, foodstuffs, textiles, tailoring, leather, rubber, chemicals and minerals. Foreign trade is extensive and has been on the increase for years. About 45 per cent of Sweden's shipping is devoted to the service of other countries. Exports include matches, copper, ball-bearings, telephone equipment, illuminating gas equipment and electrical equipment.

*The Historical Background as Related to Sweden's Modern Government and Politics.*³ Sweden has long been a true democracy, for it has been governed by its people from time immemorial. There have been occasions, as there were at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when the trend toward royal absolutism appeared, and this was particularly true in medieval times. The Swedish constitutional development, however, has been directed towards increasing law and order accompanied by a balance of power among the highest governmental authorities. As an example of this balance the early government was divided among four equally strong estates. Even before the fourteenth century, the king and judges met the free peasantry in the well-known "Ting" or assembly. The modern Riksdag dates its beginnings to 1435, when the first general assembly of the people was held at Arboga. In 1611 King Gustavus Adolphus gave a constitution to Sweden in his Royal Assurances, which finally was incorporated in the Constitution of 1809, and which, incidentally, is the oldest European written constitution now in force.

³ See Elis Håstad, "The Political System," Chapter 2 in *Sweden, A Wartime Survey* (New York: The American-Swedish News Exchange, Inc., n.d.).

*Constitutional History.*⁴ The bases of Swedish government are to be found in four fundamental laws: the Constitution Act, 1809; the Act of Settlement, 1810; the Law of the Riksdag, 1866; and the Law of the Freedom of the Press, 1812. There are in addition a number of constitutional regulations. In order to change one of these fundamental laws it is necessary for two independently elected second chambers to vote the change.

The King. At the head of the state stand the King, an hereditary monarch, who under the Act of Settlement is a member of the House of Bernadotte. He is assisted by a Council and with that body exercises supreme executive and judicial authority. Through his cabinet and by himself he exercises general administrative functions although the Constitution describes in some detail how those functions shall be carried out under the title of "regulations for the conduct of the administration." Together with the Legislature he is the legislative authority. While the Legislature in practice exercises normal law-making powers, the King has an absolute veto power and can also initiate legislation when he so desires. The royal veto, however, is seldom used. Most important legislative measures are initiated by the government.

The Cabinet and State Administration. The Cabinet is composed of the heads of the state departments, which number not less than eight nor more than ten. In addition there are three consultative ministers or ministers without portfolio. The more important administrative offices are those of Justice, Foreign Affairs, Defense, Interior, Communications, Finance, Education, Ecclesiastical Affairs, and Commerce.

Each of these ministries includes many boards such as that of Agriculture. Closely akin to these agencies are the Bank of Sweden (*Riksbanken*) governed by a board of seven members, the National Debt Office (*Riksgäldskontoret*), the Riksdag Library, and the government auditors, whose chief duties are to supervise the application of supplies voted by the Riksdag.⁵

The Riksdag. In 1866 the Swedish Riksdag of four estates was abolished and the bicameral system based on equal suffrage was established. Ten years later a prime minister, appointed by the King, was created, and with him appeared a modern parlia-

⁴ See *The Sweden Year-Book, 1938* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wicksells, 1938), especially pp. 6-20.

⁵ Håstad, *op. cit.*

mentary cabinet. Several decades elapsed before full advantage was taken of this form of government and general suffrage introduced. Because of the system of proportional representation now in vogue in Sweden it is difficult to avoid coalition cabinets, which has made it possible for small parties following a middle course to exercise great influence in Sweden's parliamentary affairs. As in most constitutional monarchies, the crown is the symbol in terms of which the Riksdag action is taken. The Swedish Riksdag is remarkable for its lack of bias in the conduct of state affairs. Under this system the leading parties (not a single party) exercise great influence over the makeup and conduct of the Cabinet. As indicated, it would be impossible for the Riksdag to function on strictly party lines.

This body is made up of an Upper and Lower Chamber. The Upper Chamber consists of 150 members elected by the county councils (*Landstingen*) for terms of eight years by a system of proportional representation. The Lower Chamber consists of 230 members elected from the country at large, which is divided into 28 elective districts for that purpose, for a term of four years. Those eligible to vote include all Swedes above 23 years of age except wards, bankrupts and inmates of workhouses.⁶ Special parliamentary committees have been set up for the protection of the freedom of the press, the national debt, libraries, and government auditing.⁷

The speakers of both houses until 1921 were appointed by the King, but since that time each house has elected its own presiding officer. The Constitution Act set up two parliamentary officials (*Justitieombudsmannen* and the *Militieombudsmannen*) to supervise both the civil and military administration, and to receive complaints of the private citizens against government officials in the performance of their administrative functions, thus safeguarding the liberty of the subject. In addition the Riksdag has full and complete power including initiative in the matter of taxation. Thus it may be seen that while the King has large powers, Sweden is in fact and in theory ruled by its Riksdag.

*Parties.*⁸ Obviously the political parties play a major role under

⁶ J. S. Hartmann, *Sveriges Riksdag under Fem Århundraden* (Stockholm: Bonniers, 1935).

⁷ *Sweden Year-Book*, 1938, p. 12.

⁸ Elis Håstad, *Det Moderna Partiväsendets Organisation* (Stockholm: Bonniers, 1938).

this form of government, and Swedish democracy can be said to rest upon its parties, who have great freedom and power although they were subject to supervision during the war period. The main parties are the Social Democrats (socialistically inclined), the Conservatives (the opponents of the Social Democrats), the Agricultural Union, the People's Party, the Socialists and a few Communists. In 1923 the Liberals split into two groups based on the prohibition question, but were reunited again in 1934 into the People's Party. The Agricultural or Farmer's Union includes generally all specialized agricultural interests, and its members feel free to shift from one group to another. In 1939, a new ministry was drawn from the Conservatives or Farmer's Union, the People's Party, and the Social Democrats under an agreement, which was never published, calling for neutrality and rearmament. It was replaced by a Social Democratic cabinet on July 31, 1945.

There are relatively few extremes in party positions as compared with those in several other countries; and, in the years of World War II, since most of the party leaders were accorded influential positions in the cabinet, wartime problems were shifted for decision and management from the legislature to the executive branch of the government. Thus, the cabinet has gathered a number of important legislative functions unto itself.

Judiciary. The courts of Sweden are highly regarded. The legal system took its chief characteristics from the Law of 1734, but it is of ancient and honorable origin and has remained unchanged for more than two hundred years. The courts of first instance are of two types. The rural districts fall into provinces and these are divided into 125 circuits, each with its presiding judge. This district court (*Häradsrätt*) is assisted by 12 unpaid jurors elected for a term of six years. In the towns the city court (*Rådhusrätt*) is composed of a chief justice and two associate judges. In large towns there may be several judges. While most judges are appointed by the King, the city court justices are sometimes elected. In matters concerning trade two elected laymen assist the justices. Both the provincial courts and the city courts have jurisdiction over all actions regardless of the value.

There are three courts of second instance located at Stockholm (*Svea Hovrätt*), at Jonköping (*Gota Hovrätt*), and Malmö (*Skåne and Blekinge Hovrätt*). These are courts of appeal, and appeal is

granted to them in all cases, both civil and criminal with the privilege of introducing new evidence.

The Supreme Court (*Högsta Domstolen*) is located in Stockholm and consists of 24 members. Here procedure is in writing, while in the courts of first instance it is oral. In the courts of appeal hearings on criminal cases are oral.

In addition to these tribunals there are a number of special courts dealing with water rights, courts martial, police matters, and labor agreements. The supreme administrative court (*Regeringsrätt*) is made up of seven members, while the three supreme court justices and one member of the supreme administrative court make up the Law Council (*Lagrådet*).⁹

Local Government. Local government is organized on a rural-urban basis. For purposes of general administration the country is divided into twenty-four counties (*län*) and the county corporate of Stockholm. Each county government is headed by a governor and has a chief clerk, a chief constable, and a county council composed of at least twenty members elected for four years by the villagers. There are 119 bailiwicks and 489 constabulary districts. Five towns with populations over 50,000 have their own town councils. These are Stockholm, Malmö, Norrköping, Hälsingborg, and Gäddede. The Ratepayers' Assembly is the chief organ of the rural government. It is made up of from 5 to 11 members. Cities are headed by a city board of 12 to 15 members, supported by parishes which in their turn fall under the control of assemblies. In the towns, governmental responsibility lies in the town assembly or the town council.¹⁰

Recent Developments. No significant changes have been made in Sweden's governmental organizations as a result of the World War II. In the war-time elections the voters indicated clearly that the country wished to follow a policy of national unity, neutrality and rearmament. The September, 1944, elections to the Lower Chamber reduced Social Democratic representation from 134 to 115 seats out of the total of 230. The Conservatives, Agrarians, Liberals and Communists all increased their representations.

Foreign Policy. To the outside world the most notable thing about Swedish government has been its ability to maintain a

⁹ See Martindale-Hubbel, *Law Dictionary* (New York, Martindale-Hubbel Law Directory, Inc., 1931).

¹⁰ See *Sweden Year-Book*, 1938, pp. 18-20.

neutral position in two major world wars. This policy was adopted over a century ago and has been maintained successfully through national and international crises. In 1905 Norway was allowed to establish its independence without bloodshed and after World War I, even though Sweden might well have obtained the Åland Islands, she refrained from doing so. A temperate, shrewd, balanced, and consistent neutrality is the distinguishing mark of Swedish foreign policy.

NORWAY

*Geopolitical Aspects of Norway.*¹¹ Norway is a country of mountains. Along its shores are 150,000 islands, and the total land area is approximately 124,556 square miles. The climate is mild, being influenced by the Gulf Stream. Coal, gypsum, granite, iron ore and zinc are among the natural resources. For the most part the land has a generous covering of forests. Whaling, fishing and shipping are the chief occupations of the people. The Norwegians are of the same stock as the Swedes, blond Nordics, occasionally crossed with groups from other countries. The language bears a close resemblance to Swedish, as does the culture as a whole.

*Historical Background.*¹² This country was consolidated from several small groups during the ninth or tenth centuries. In the fourteenth century Sweden, Norway and Denmark were combined into a single union under Queen Margareta's centralized rule. In 1449, Sweden broke away from that union, but Norway and Denmark continued their partnership until the nineteenth century. In 1536, Denmark terminated the independent existence of Norway, but by 1660, a joint central administration for both kingdoms was established, and in the Peace of Kiel Jan. 14, 1814, Norway was ceded to Sweden, while Iceland, Greenland, and the Faeroe Islands, which had formerly belonged to Norway, were retained by Denmark. Finally, in 1905, as a result of a consolidation of the Liberal party with other political groups Norway broke away from Sweden and set herself up as an independent state.

¹¹ See Lyde, *op. cit.*, Ch. 19.

¹² A brief sketch of the histories of all these lands is found in the four chapters by the author in the symposium J. S. Roucek, ed., *Contemporary Europe* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1941), Chs. 21-24.

*Constitutional History.*¹³ The Danish Prince Carl was elected King of Norway on Nov. 18, 1905; but the party collaboration, which had resulted in Norwegian independence, soon disappeared. The liberal party broke away from its moderate moorings and an independent Liberal party was established with a conservative trend. A Labor party, which in 1905 was of little significance, grew in strength, and the Social Democrats increased in power with the passing of time.

*Constitution.*¹⁴ The Norwegian Constitution was enacted May 14, 1814, and it consisted of five sections which dealt with: (1) government and religion, (2) the executive power, (3) citizenship and legislation, (4) courts, and (5) general provisions. Here, as in Sweden, the government is one of a limited monarchy, and the legislative power is vested in the Storting, while the King exercises his power in the Council.

The King. The Norwegian King is the chief executive. In many ways his functions are similar to those of the Swedish King. However, with respect to the Storting his legislative powers are less than those of the King of Sweden in regard to the Riksdag. In the matter of governmental power in general the Norwegian King stands at a midpoint between the Kings of Sweden and of England, not as strong as the first, not as weak as the second.

The Cabinet and State Administration. The chief administrative officers are the King and Cabinet, including the customary ministers of Foreign Affairs, Finance, Justice, Police, Defense, Commerce, Industry, Ecclesiastical Matters, Education, Public Works, Social Affairs and Agriculture. The Cabinet is headed by a prime minister. The central administration consists of the ministry and the general-in-command, the admiral-in-command, the director of public prosecution, state auditors, and the branches of agriculture, forestry, savings banks, harbors, light-houses, shipping, fishery and postal administration, telegraph, telephone and public health.

Cabinet actions are taken in the form of royal decrees, which can only be adopted when a quorum is present. Civil servants are appointed by the King-in-Council under an act of 1918. With few exceptions they cannot be removed except when retirement falls due.

The Storting and the Parliamentary System. The Storting or

¹³ See, *The Norway Year Book* (Oslo, Mortensen, 1938), pp. 49-63.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

parliament is composed of 150 representatives, one-third from the towns and two-thirds from the rural districts, elected by all Norwegian people over 23 years of age, who have lived in Norway for five years or more. This legislature has the right to enact all necessary laws. The Constitution vests all legislative powers in this body. All disputes governing the right to vote must be brought before it, and not before the common courts. Only the Storting can naturalize aliens.

Early in the session it divides itself into the so-called Lagting, composed of approximately one-third of its membership, and the Odelsting, composed of the other three-quarters. All laws are dealt with by these two bodies in separate sessions. The Odels-ting exercises constitutional control. Having split in this fashion both bodies are then divided into permanent legislative committees which handle legislation in orthodox fashion. A Committee on Finance and Customs Revenue submits a tentative State Budget at the beginning of regular sessions. This committee follows the budget through all of its stages until finally adopted. Membership is determined by the Election Committee of the Storting.

Among the Storting's many functions are the power to determine succession to the throne, the right to receive notification of treaties with foreign powers, the receiving of bills from private citizens, and complete control over taxation and the finances of the state.

*Political Parties.*¹⁵ During the nineteenth century the Storting was split between the Conservative Party and the more liberal elements. The struggle for control led to a diminution of the power of the King and the ministers, especially in the Storting's resolutions of 1872. Thereupon, a struggle broke out between the Crown and the Legislature. The personal power of the King came to an end, and the Storting achieved decisive control, which it has never lost since. The Left Party founded in 1884, as a result of quarrels over policies, split in 1887 into the radical left and the moderate left wings. One of the conservative governments attempted to heal the breach with the result that it was driven from control in 1891.

In their struggle for separation from Sweden in 1905 all Norwegian parties were for the moment able to enjoy a common pur-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 71-75.

pose; but no sooner was independence achieved than they separated. In 1918, the Revolutionary Party broke away from governmental control and in 1921 the Social Democrats did also. In 1923, the Labor Party severed relations with the Third International and thereupon a separate Communist Party was formed. In 1927, the Social Democrats rejoined the Labor Party and in 1935, the political alliance between the Agrarian and the Labor Parties resulted in formation of a new Labor Government. In the parliamentary elections of Oct. 8, 1945, Labor won 76 of the 150 seats in the Storting and another Labor Government was formed.

The Judiciary. Norwegian courts were established under a law of 1915, which went into effect in 1927. Criminal courts consist of examining courts (*Forhørsretten*), district and town courts, the "Lagmann's" courts, and the Supreme Court. The activities of the police are especially significant in the Norwegian system of justice. The country is divided into 55 police districts each headed by a Commissioner of Police. It is the duty of the police to maintain public order and to prevent crimes and bring criminals to justice.

Civil courts begin with a court or council of conciliation in each municipality, whose function it is to mediate between parties. No legal dispute can be heard by a court unless mediation has first been attempted. Tribunals of first instance are the district town courts and the magistrates in the smaller communities. Courts of second instance are the Courts of Appeal, and above them there is the Supreme Court.

Local Government. Local administration is regulated by the Act of 1937, which provides for urban and rural districts councils. Municipalities are of two kinds, namely, chartered cities and towns. Rural district municipalities are made up of one or more parishes. The urban municipal representatives are chosen by popular election, and constitute a city council or country districts council depending upon the municipality they head. The chairman of the council in a municipality is the legal representative of the council in local affairs. These councils have control of ordinary subjects such as police, taxation, social affairs, education, and health. The most important of these is education.

In many ways local government is based upon the same pattern as the Swedish. But because municipal affairs are so extensive in Norway both in scope and range, the central government

supervises many municipal affairs, especially financial ones. In order to do this most effectively all positive acts of the local councils must receive the approval of the county governor. Local government extends not only to social and cultural matters, but also to technical subjects such as roads, harbors, sanitation, fire control, parks, gas, electricity, baths, cinemas, and many similar subjects.

Recent Developments. When the Germans invaded Norway in 1941, the King and the ministry fled to England.¹⁶ A new regime, based upon the Norwegian version of German National Socialism and headed by Vidkun Quisling, was established in Norway on the leadership principle under German sponsorship. A legislative body called the Nasjonal Samling became the sounding board for the Quisling government. Closest cooperation with the German occupiers developed with the result that national socialistic institutions became the order of the day. Meanwhile, the government in exile was established at London, headed by the King, continuing in power the ministry which had fled with him.

When the Axis were defeated, Norway was again free to set up her own government. The King and government returned from exile, Quisling was tried, convicted and executed for treason, and the restoration of the government on the old lines was undertaken.

DENMARK

*The Geopolitical Aspects of Denmark.*¹⁷ Denmark and its many islands lie to the north of Germany. It is a small state of some 16,570 square miles, with rolling flat country, short rivers, lakes, ponds, and 80 per cent of its land devoted to farming. Lying on the trade route from the Baltic to the North Sea it occupies a strategically important position. The control of the Skagerrak and the Kattegat has been the source of tremendous power in times gone by.

¹⁶ See Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, *Modern World Politics* (New York: Crowell, 1942), pp. 431-432.

¹⁷ In 1918 Iceland became a sovereign state in the Danish Act of Union of that year. The King of Denmark remained the King of Iceland and the *Althing* or Parliament became the most important part of the governmental body. The same Supreme Court served both Denmark and Iceland. For geopolitical information see Lyde, *op. cit.*, Ch. 12.

The Danes are a Nordic nation, numbering just under 4,000,000. Once a formidable power on the continent of Europe, they are now one of the smaller groups.

Historical Background. About the tenth century the Danes occupied substantial sections of Europe and England, and in the twelfth century, under the leadership of King Valdemar, they challenged the might of the Teutonic Knights and took most of Estonia from them. Then they were at the peak of their strength. At the end of the fourteenth century the three Scandinavian countries, Denmark, Norway and Sweden (of which Finland was a part) were joined in the Kalmar Union. When Sweden broke away, Norway remained attached to Denmark until 1814. Denmark meanwhile gradually lost power, and in the middle of the nineteenth century she lost both Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia. Part of Schleswig was regained from Germany after World War I. In 1940 Denmark was occupied by German forces.

Iceland, which had been under Danish rule since 1264, was recognized as an independent state under the Danish king in 1918 and declared its complete independence from Denmark on June 17, 1944. Allied forces had occupied Iceland after the German invasion of Denmark.

*Constitutional Development.*¹⁸ Danish constitutional history is one of abrupt changes. In 1660, Denmark experienced an extensive reorganization which established an unrestricted monarchy by the "King's Law." This was a constitution depriving the Riksdag of its power which it had abused and failed to use properly under the leadership of incompetent nobles. This new constitution of 1660 established a new nobility and lowered the peasantry to abject wretchedness. Reforms, however, were inaugurated at the end of the eighteenth century designed to improve the lot of the peasant. These were so extreme for the time that Denmark was regarded as a radical country. When Europe was rent by the revolutions of 1830, Denmark was numbered among the states affected. The franchise was then extended to well-to-do people in provincial elections.

The new constitutional act of June 5, 1849, created a thoroughly modern and free state, modeled upon the Belgian pattern of 1831 and permeated with an idealistic democracy.

¹⁸ See *Denmark, 1934* (Copenhagen: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1934), pp. 18-24.

When in 1864, Denmark lost both Schleswig and Holstein, the wealthy and heavy taxpayers were given especially advantageous representation in both houses of Parliament.

Finally, when the peasantry gained control of the Second Chamber, they ran into conflict with a Conservative government which further served to harden them in their resolve that the Second Chamber should be thoroughly democratized at the first opportunity. A new constitutional act on June 5, 1915, saw this determination realized. Amendments were made on the 10th of September, 1920, but did not particularly affect the Constitution of 1915.

The Constitutional Act of 1915 changed most of the bases of the act of 1849, introducing a more extensive franchise, including that of women, and defining legislative authority as resting both in the Crown and the Parliament. At the same time it vested the Crown with executive power for the administration of justice through the courts. The Lutheran Church was recognized as the state church, and provisions were made for the impeachment of the ministers by the King or the Second Chamber in case of failure to perform their duties. Limitations were placed upon the King, who previously had been able to declare war, conclude peace, enter into alliances, make treaties, or cede any part of the country without the sanction of Parliament. Provisions were also made for a Parliament of two chambers along the lines already described. All men and women of Danish nationality over 25 years of age, and residents of Denmark, were granted the franchise.¹⁹

The King. The Danish King, like the Swedish King, is mentioned in the Constitution as the head of the executive department and as the joint possessor with Parliament of the legislative power. Constitutionally he "can do no wrong." He participates with the Second Chamber in the impeaching of ministers. King Christian X by his conduct, especially during the German occupation, enhanced the prestige of the monarchy to a marked degree.

The Cabinet and Administration. The King as the head of the government is assisted by the Council. This Council or Cabinet consists of the heads of the different ministries of which the chief are: the Prime Minister, ministries of Foreign Affairs, War,

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Navy, Justice, Home Affairs, Social Affairs, Trade and Industry, Shipping and Fishing, Public Works, Agriculture, and Ecclesiastical Affairs and Education. There is a very strong emphasis upon social matters and also upon all cooperative efforts. Six of the ministries are devoted to cultural or intellectual development and to economic promotion. Because of the numerous political parties and because no one party has a decisive majority over all the rest, the Danish cabinets are apt to be coalition cabinets.

Parliament. The Danish Parliament like those of Sweden and Norway is bicameral. The first chamber is called the Landsting, the second the Folketing. Elections for the 149 members of the Folketing are by general direct election for a term of office of four years. Nineteen of the 76 members of the Landsting are co-opted while the rest are elected indirectly by the citizenry for a term of eight years. The King may dissolve the Folketing at any time, but the Landsting can be dissolved only under special circumstances. In all matters except those concerning financial measures, which must be initiated by the Folketing, the two Chambers are equal.

Parties. There are seven political parties: Conservatives, Liberal Left, Radical Left, Social Democrats, Communists, Justice Union, and the Slesvig Party, the first four of which are substantial in number. The Conservatives are chiefly commercial people; the Liberal Left are rural; the Radical Left are the small property owners; the Social Democrats draw heavily upon the trade unions in town and country. As in the other Scandinavian states, the Social Democrats are particularly strong.²⁰

In the 1945 elections the relative strengths of the parties as represented in the Folketing and the Landsting respectively were: Social Democrats, 48 and 34; Liberal, 38 and 18; Conservatives, 26 and 14; Communists, 18 and 0; Radical Liberals, 11 and 8; Nationalists, 4 and 0; others, 3 and 2. The most powerful single party is the Social Democratic group, but a Liberal cabinet was formed Nov. 7, 1945.

Judiciary. As a general rule cases are dealt with in two courts, civil and criminal. There are over a hundred courts of first instance, usually presided over by a judge, scattered throughout the land. There are two so-called *landsretter*, which cover the

²⁰ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

islands, and the courts of second instance. The ordinary court of appeal is the Supreme Court, the highest tribunal of the land, which consists of a president and 12 judges. Trials are public, and jury service is compulsory in certain criminal cases. There are, of course, maritime and commercial courts, as is true in the other Scandinavian countries as well. In addition there is a special court for the settlement of labor disputes. Finally ecclesiastical offenses and military delinquencies are dealt with by ecclesiastical and military tribunals.

Local Government. The country is divided into twenty-two counties.²¹ These are administered by a Governor (*Amtmand*), who superintends the working of the law and subordinate officials. The local government is placed chiefly in the hands of municipal councils filled by elections for terms of four years. The City of Copenhagen is ruled by a lord lieutenant (*Overpræsidenten*). There are 55 members on the Copenhagen Council. Here, even more than in the national setup, the Social Democrats hold a substantial majority. Provincial towns are governed by town councils, while local bodies in rural districts consist of the county council and the parish council. The town councils elect their own chairman, who thus becomes the mayor. Financial matters in Copenhagen are vested in an Executive Council (*Magistraten*) which is made up of 10 members: 5 are salaried aldermen and 5 are burgomasters elected from the Council (*Borgerrepræsentationen*).

All this local government falls under the Ministry of Home Affairs, which has the final voice in local matters. In general these matters pertain to schools, poor relief, roads, hospitals and local public services.

Recent Developments. When the Germans invaded Denmark, the King and his Parliament and Cabinet remained and continued to carry on the established government. Unlike Norway, Denmark did not have a government in exile, nor did it experience an overturn in governmental machinery as a consequence of German invasion. However, the Cabinet and Rigsdag were forced to suspend their activities from August 29, 1943, to the end of the war when they rejected German demands that Danish saboteurs be tried in German courts. The end of the war saw a release from German domination and a return to independence.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25-27.

FINLAND

*Geopolitical Aspects.*²² Finland, the easternmost Scandinavian land, borders on Russia and is a buffer state between that country and northern European powers. Because of this location Finland has constantly been forced to fight Russia. It is a land of many lakes, rivers, islands, swamps and ponds, endowed with limited natural resources which include timber, quartz, copper, iron, nickel, zinc, feldspar, lime and low-grade asbestos. Excellent forests must be added to this list as the greatest single natural resource.

The people, as already noted, differ racially from the other Scandinavian peoples, and are of Finno-Ugrian stock. Long centuries of association with the Scandinavian people, however, have given Finland a culture similar to that of all Scandinavia. For example, Swedish was the official language of the country for centuries.

*Historical Background.*²³ In the twelfth century Sweden began a series of wars which made Finland a part of the Kingdom of Sweden. Finland seems, however, to have enjoyed a substantial degree of independence under this arrangement, and it was not until the latter part of the sixteenth century, when she took part in a losing revolt against Charles IX, that she was more closely integrated into the Swedish kingdom. There she remained until the Napoleonic wars, when in 1809 she was transferred to Russia. Czar Alexander gave her autonomy, constituted her a grand duchy, and permitted her to retain her own constitution. In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Russification of Finland was tried and at the beginning of the twentieth century these measures became so strong that Finland joined the general revolt throughout Russia in 1905; and, when World War I came along, Finland declared her independence in 1917. She adopted a new constitution in June, 1919, and supplemented it by the Parliamentary Act of January 13, 1928, and the Electoral Law of 1935.

Constitutional History. The Finnish government was established by the Act of July 17, 1919, and by the additional Acts of 1929 and 1935 just referred to. These acts cannot be described

²² See Lyde, *op. cit.*, Ch. 24.

²³ See Kaarlo Blomstedt, *Finland, Its Country and People, A Short Survey* (Helsinki: Government Printing Office, 1919).

as a uniform written constitution. They go back for their beginnings to the Diet of Bårge of 1809 which reaffirmed the earlier Swedish government of 1772, then in power in Finland; and this latter form of government in its turn, went back for precedence to the Swedish Parliament Act of 1617, which created the Diet and gave form to the government.

Finnish government has always been democratic in form and practice. As late as 1906 a special act gave greater rights to Parliament, and these provisions were incorporated directly into the 1919 constitution. Finnish parliamentary government consists of a President, and a Diet, the President being aided by a Cabinet. In the absence of a President, the Prime Minister fulfills his duties. As in Sweden, the cabinet is responsible to the President, although the President usually follows the Cabinet's recommendations.

The President and Cabinet. The Finnish President has great personal power in spite of the Constitution. He is elected for a term of six years by indirect ballot and by an electoral college of 300 members under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister. While he may decide as he deems best, he is by law bound to consult the Cabinet when taking important decisions. His veto is absolute, and his signature needs no ministerial countersignature. The supreme executive power rests in the hands of the President and it is the power of the President to convene Parliament in extra sessions and to initiate legislation.

He is supported by the ministers whose duty it is to put the laws into effect. He is also commander-in-chief of the military forces. The ministry consists of the Prime Minister, the Ministers of Justice, Interior, Defense, Finance, Education, Agriculture, Communication, Public Works, Trades and Industry, and Social Affairs. There is a series of lower administrative bodies aiding the ministry. Among them are the statistical office, the government medical board, the insurance council, the school board, the ecclesiastical board, and a number of others.

*The Diet.*²⁴ Since 1906 the Diet has consisted of a single chamber of 200 deputies, elected by proportional representation by citizens over the age of 24. In order to protect the rights of minorities and to prevent hasty legislation by this unicameral legislature, one-third of the deputies may postpone action on a bill

²⁴ *The Finland Year Book, 1939-1940* (Helsinki: Oy. Suomen Kirja, Ltd., 1939), pp. 9-11.

until after the following general election if they wish. The President has the power of dissolving the Diet and appointing new members, and the new Diet must assemble in ninety days.

Legislation, because of this single chamber, is complicated. At the start of a session, a grand committee composed of 45 members selected from the whole membership, is set up and acts in many ways as an upper house. In order to change a fundamental law it is necessary for a bill to be passed by one Diet and then subsequently passed by a two-thirds vote in the following newly elected Diet. The President and the Diet have the power of initiating bills, and the President has the right of postponing action by veto. The Swedish minority possesses equal privileges with the Finnish majority.

Parties. Political parties are representative of public opinion, the strongest being the Social Democratic Party, which, however, is not a majority party. The principal parties are: Social Democrats, Agrarian Union, Swedish People's, National Coalition, Patriotic People's Movement, Progressives, Small Farmers and People's. The system of proportional representation gives excellent opportunity for coalition cabinets. It is significant, however, that throughout the period of the two wars with Russia, in 1939-1940 and 1941-1944 the Diet continued to operate, determined the presidencies, fixed the terms of peace, and in a complete and thorough democratic fashion expressed the wishes of the people. For many years, the Communist Party was outlawed, especially as a result of the bitter feud and warfare between Whites and the Reds when Finland established her independence in 1917-1918 from Russia.²⁵ Now with Russia preponderant in eastern Europe, the Finnish Communists are a legal party and are growing in number. How much of this growth represents returning Communists is still impossible to tell.

Judiciary. In every town there is a court of first instance. Above these are three courts of appeal or of second instance; and, above all stands the Supreme Court of the country. There is also a Supreme Court of Administration and several special courts such as the Supreme Court of Impeachment, Land Partition Courts, Courts Martial, and a Supreme Military Court. The country is divided into seventy judicial districts, which in their turn are divided into assize divisions. The assizes are held every

²⁵ See J. O. Hannula, *Finland's War of Independence* (London: Faber and Faber, 1939).

fall and spring, and they make use of a 5 to 12 man jury presided over by a judge. Both civil and criminal cases are dealt with. The final court of appeal is the Supreme Court of Administration which consists of 13 councilors of state and a president.

Local Government. For local administrative purposes, Finland is divided into 10 provinces which are again subdivided into 55 districts. Each province is headed by a governor who is responsible to the Ministry of the Interior. He is the chief political officer of the province, has directing and executive authority, and performs several other functions. Each district is headed by a bailiff.

Local government, however, rests chiefly in 38 municipal communes, 27 urban district communes, and 533 rural communes. A large degree of autonomy is exercised by these communes, which are subject in only a slight degree to the central administration. They tax, seize property, and elect their own officials; deal with fire protection, education, police, sanitation, harbors, and buildings; and perform the usual public services. Municipal communes are governed by a town board with permanent committees; rural communes are governed by a communal board. These board or council members are elected every three years.

Recent Developments. During the two recent Russian wars the democratic nature of the Finnish government remained unimpaired, but ministers rose and fell as the fortunes of war dictated. In August, 1944, Baron Mannerheim and Antti Hackzell were named President and Prime Minister respectively and given emergency powers to negotiate peace. The peace which resulted was followed by Allied (chiefly Russian) control. As a result, while the government remains as described above, there is a tendency towards the Left which grows out of Russian preponderance.

RECENT TRENDS

Sweden. Sweden's history during 1947, as compared with that of her Scandinavian neighbors, was uneventful. Gustaf V saw his 89th birthday, Albin Hansson died, and Tage Erlander succeeded him as Prime Minister. Economic and social problems occupied the center of the stage. Exchange difficulties required the sending of gold to the United States, social reformists pressed for new and more comprehensive legislation, and a moderate

inflation took place. The Swedish people became more and more aware of the difficult position of their country located as she is between Russia on the one hand and Britain and the United States on the other. The question frequently asked was, how long will it be before war comes?

Denmark. In Denmark, Christian X died on April 6, and was succeeded in two weeks by the Crown Prince who became Frederick IX. The Cabinet of Knud Kristensen resigned on October 3, because of criticisms of its proposed South Schleswig plebiscite, and new elections were ordered for October 28. They resulted in the Social Democrats capturing 57 of the seats in the lower house and the Agrarians 48, while the Communists lost 9 of their 18 seats. On the basis of this election the Cabinet handed in its official resignation on October 30.

On November 12, the Social Democrats under Hans Hedtoft formed a new coalition party Cabinet, which retained much of the former personnel. Meanwhile, Communist activities which had experienced considerable impetus early in the year tended to slacken off toward the close, and the elections definitely showed a waning of Communist influence. It was as a result of Communist pressure that Denmark on May 20, sought to have the United States withdraw from Greenland where American forces were stationed at bases constructed under an agreement of April 9, 1941. Negotiations were still going on without results when the year ended.

Norway. Norway's main concern was a demand by Russia on January 10, that Norway and Russia enter into negotiations for a modification of the Svalbaard fifteen-power agreement, which gave Norway the control over the Spitzbergen archipelago. However, the United States and Great Britain protested that Norway and Russia could not bilaterally change the agreement, and the Storting voted 101 to 11 (the Communists) not to enter into the discussions with the Russians on the subject.

In the October 27 municipal elections both Labor and the Communists lost to the Center and Right Parties. The winning parties were in order as follows: Liberals, Agricultural Conservatives, and Christian People's Party.

Finland. On February 10, the treaty of peace between Finland and the United Nations was signed at Paris, with the following nations participating: U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Australia, White Russia, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Greece,

India, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, the Ukraine, and South Africa. It was a period of great privation in which the reparations which Finland had to pay to Russia were a terrific burden on everyone in the state. On April 11, Mauno Pekkala's Cabinet resigned, but returned again to office on May 21.

Finland made an attempt to enter the United Nations, but her application was vetoed by Russia, although this did not prevent Finland from entering into several other international organizations, such as the F.A.O. In the fall a serious strike developed among government workers, which interrupted communications, transportation and schools. Meanwhile Finland continued to make her payments on the American loan. On October 15, the security law, including censorship, which had been in existence since 1939, was repealed. This was a year of slow recovery, heavy payments, and gradual re-entry into the international community.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The main problem for Scandinavia to solve during 1947 was that of communism. On the whole the Communists were fighting a slow, losing battle; but their opponents were always apprehensive, for they feared that almost any day the Communists might call upon and receive assistance from Russia. The menace of Russia always loomed over the Scandinavian nations. They were warned by innuendo not to participate in the European Recovery Program, a warning which they did not heed. On August 28, after a two-day session, the Foreign Ministers of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Iceland agreed to meet to discuss a customs union. Russia promptly announced that a Scandinavian customs union could only be construed as unfriendly to the U.S.S.R. These were typical examples of the close control which Russia exercised over the supposedly free Scandinavian states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL

ARNESON, BEN A., *The Democratic Monarchies of Scandinavia* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1939). Scholarly, authoritative.

BELLQUIST, ERIC C., "Government and Politics in Northern Europe," *Post-War Governments of Europe* (Gainesville, Florida: Kallman Publ. Co., 1946), pp. 362-391.

GRAHAM, MALBONE W., *New Governments of Eastern Europe* (New York: Holt, 1927).

HERLITZ, NILS, *Svensk Frihet* (P. A. Norstedts & Söner Förlag, 1943). An excellent conception of the Scandinavian views on individual freedom.

Peace and Security after the Second World War. Published by the Swedish Institute of International Affairs (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1945). A Swedish contribution to the subject.

The Northern Countries in World Economy, Denmark-Finland-Iceland-Norway-Sweden (2d rev. ed.). Published by the Delegations for the Promotion of Economic Cooperation Between the Northern Countries. (Printed in Finland by Otava Printing Office, 1939).

ROUCEK, JOSEPH, ed., *Central Eastern Europe* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946), Chapter XX.

———, ed., *Contemporary Europe* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1941), Chapters XXI-XXIV.

YEARBOOKS

Denmark 1947 (Copenhagen: Royal Danish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, and the Danish Statistical Department, 1947).

The Finland Year Book 1939-1940 (Helsinki: Oy. Suomen Kirja, Ltd., 1939).

Hvem, Hva, Hvor, 1947, Aftenpostens Oppslagsbok (Oslo: Chr. Schibsteds Förlag, 1947).

Hvem, Hva, Hvor, 1947 Politikens Opslagsbog (Copenhagen: 1947).

När, Var och Hur, 1947 (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1947).

The Norway Year Book, third issue (Oslo: Sverre Mortensen Forlag A.S., 1938).

The Sweden Year Book 1938 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksells Boktryckeri, A.B., 1938).

SWEDEN

BELLQUIST, ERIC C., *Some Aspects of the Recent Foreign Policy of Sweden* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1929). Reliable for the first ten years under review.

CHILDS, M. W., *Sweden: The Middle Way* (New Haven: Yale, 1936). A popular description of Swedish cooperatives.

COLE, M. and SMITH, C., *Democratic Sweden* (London: Routledge, 1938). A valuable analysis of the government, its structure and policy.

- Frihet och Samhälle* (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1943). A discussion of Swedish democracy and freedom, which may be taken as typically Scandinavian.
- HÄSTAD, ELIS, *Partierna i Regering och Riksdag* (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1938). A balanced and revealing discussion of the role of the parties in Swedish parliamentary and administrative activities.
- MUNTELL, HENRIK, *Svensk Rättstradition* (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1942). A useful treatment of the Swedish legal system.
- MYRDAL, ALVA, *Nation and Family* (New York: Harper, 1941). A study of family welfare in modern Sweden.
- SÖLVÉN, ARNOLD, *Svensk Arbetsfredspolitik* (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1940). A very useful discussion of the Scandinavian approach to labor problems. This, of course, deals with Sweden alone, but may be taken as typical.
- Sweden: A Wartime Survey* (New York: American-Swedish News Exchange, Inc., n.d.). Readable and reliable.

NORWAY

- GRIMLEY, O. B., *The New Norway* (Oslo: Johan Grundt Tanum, 1939). Instructive.
- HARDY, G. G., *Norway* (London: Benn, 1925). A good historical background.
- MYKLEBOSY, TOR, *They Came as Friends* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1945). A picture of Norway under the Nazis.
- Social Work in Oslo-Norway* (Oslo: Oslo, 1939). An excellent treatment of the social philosophy which governs Norway.
- WORM-MÜLLER, J. S., *Norway Revolts against the Nazis* (Forest Hills, N. Y.: Transatlantic Arts, 1942). The first nine months of German occupation.

DENMARK

- BIRCH, J. H. S., *Denmark in History* (London: Murray, 1938). A general survey.
- GOLDMARK, JOSEPHINE, *Democracy in Denmark* (Washington: National Home Library Foundation, 1936). A short account of the operation of the Danish government.
- MANNICHE, PETER, *Denmark: A Social Laboratory* (Copenhagen: C. E. C. Gad, 1939). The best treatment of Danish cooperatives. An example of government control, leadership, and regulation in these affairs without the resort to communism.
- PALMER, PAUL, *Denmark in Nazi Chains* (Forest Hills, N. Y.: Transatlantic Arts, 1942).

FINLAND

- GILMOUR, KAY, *Finland* (London: Methuen, 1931). A reliable descriptive work.
- HANNULA, J. O., *Finland's War of Independence* (London: Faber & Faber, 1939). A good account of the war between the Whites and Reds.
- HALLSTEN, I., *L'Activité politique et sociale des femmes en Finlande* (Helsinki: V. K., 1939). The early emancipation of women in Finland makes this treatment of their activities in social and political affairs significant.
- JACKSON, J. H., *Finland* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1938). The best general work in English.
- Loi organique de la Chambre des représentants de Finlande* (Helsinki: V. K., 1930). A 36-page discussion of the basic law governing the Finnish Diet.
- WUORINEN, JOHN H., *Finland and World War II, 1939-1944* (New York: Ronald Press, 1948).
- , *Nationalism in Modern Finland* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931). An analysis of the rise of Finnish nationalism with special reference to the language struggle.

POLAND and the BALTIC STATES

Poland and the three small Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—after winning their independence at the end of World War I, proceeded to establish European presidential types of governments; that is, the presidents were assisted by cabinets of administrative officers, who were responsible to the respective legislatures in the same manner as the French President and Cabinet are responsible to the Chamber of Deputies and the British Prime Minister and Cabinet are responsible to Parliament. In the United States both the Cabinet and the President remain in office even though they no longer possess the confidence of Congress; but in Poland and the Baltic States the parliaments under their new constitutions could, in theory at least, oust both presidents and cabinets from office at their pleasure.

Some years before World War II, however, all four governments deteriorated into dictatorships. In Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia the presidents became the dictators, while in Poland the Prime Ministers—Marshal Joseph Pilsudski and his successor, Marshal Smigly-Rydz—assumed dictatorial powers. In making this change the four countries followed the trend observed in Italy, Germany and many other countries. The strong executive became the vogue, and Poland and the Baltic States followed the fashion of the day.

During and after World War II the Russian pattern of government was imposed on all four states. The Baltic States were incorporated in the U.S.S.R. as soviet socialist republics. Poland still retains many of her former institutions but they are dominated by Russian influence. To all intents and purposes Poland is a Russian satellite.

As for local government in these countries before the war, it was unlike that found in the United States, following more closely that encountered in France and other continental European countries. Local government was, and still is, controlled and directed by a strong central government. This was one

reason why dictatorships were so easy to establish in these countries prior to 1939.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE REGION

Geopolitical Aspects. Breaking away from Russia in 1917 and 1918, Poland and the Baltic States lived a precarious existence between Russia and Germany until they were engulfed in the World War II.

Except for the southern part of Poland, which reaches the Carpathian Mountains, most of the region is rolling land with elevations well under a thousand feet above sea level. It is a region of numerous lakes and of many rivers that have a tendency to overflow their banks. Agriculture predominates; and, except in Poland, there has been little industrial development. It is an area important to continental communication and transportation, for it lies squarely across the paths connecting eastern Europe, producing raw materials, and western Europe, engaged in manufacturing. The ports of Riga, Tallinn, Reval, Baltiski, Memel, Danzig, and the more recently constructed Gdynia, amply testify to this fact. Most of the transportation lines run in an east-west direction; but in Poland, they are built to connect with the other capitals and countries of Europe.

The two predominant resources of the entire area are timber and agricultural products. The latter include wheat, rye, potatoes, sugar beets, cereal crops, dairy products, carrots, peas, buckwheat, lupine, clover, cattle, poultry, hogs and horses. Except for the Estonian oil shale, Poland possesses practically all of the non-timber and non-agricultural natural resources located in the whole region. These consist chiefly of coal, iron, zinc, salt, lead and marble. Most of the coal, zinc and iron mines are located in Upper Silesia, and during the generation between 1919 and 1939, Poland was one of the great iron, steel and textile producing countries of Europe.¹ Her newly acquired territories promise to make her even stronger in these respects in the future.

All four countries have had close trade relations with England, Germany, the United States and Russia. Except for the Polish industrial production already mentioned, the principal exports

¹ Lionel W. Lyde, *The Continent of Europe* (London: Macmillan, 1924), has excellent discussions on most of these matters, chapters 24 and 25.

prior to World War II consisted of agricultural products. Imports included raw cotton, wool, fabrics, yarn, ore, tobacco, fruit, hides and coffee. Exports included timber, sugar, hogs, zinc, eggs, cattle, iron, meat, steel, butter, rye and fertilizers.²

In 1939, Poland ranked fifth in size in Europe, with a population of approximately 34,849,000 inhabitants covering about 150,000 square miles. As a result of the war and subsequent territorial revisions, her population in 1946 was 23,911,772. About 69 per cent of the prewar population were Poles, 14 per cent Ruthenians, 2.5 per cent Germans, 8 per cent Jews, 4 per cent White Russians; thus making Poland a mainly Slavic country. The Poles were predominantly Roman Catholic in religion. Estonia, covering 18,370 square miles, had in 1939 a population of 1,127,000 inhabitants belonging to the Finno-Ugrian stock with a completely different racial and linguistic background from that of the Poles. The Estonians professed the Lutheran faith. Latvia, covering about 25,402 square miles, had a population of approximately 1,600,000 people. These were of the Baltic branch of the Indo-European family and bore closest resemblance to the Lithuanians. Their religion was Lutheran. Lithuania, occupying approximately 30,000 square miles, had a population of about 2,500,000 people who belonged to the same linguistic and racial group as the Latvians, namely the Baltic branch of the Indo-European peoples. They professed the Roman Catholic faith. Thus, this region in 1939 had a population of approximately 40,000,000 speaking four different languages, professing two different religions and earning their livelihood chiefly by agriculture.³

Lying as they did athwart the lines of communication of the powerful Russian state with the western world, and falling within the British sphere of interest in the Baltic Sea, these states before the war also fell within the zone which Germany considered her sphere of influence.⁴

² Here see J. S. Roucek, *Contemporary Europe* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1941), Chs. 19 and 20.

³ See Walter Vogel, *Das Neue Europa* (Bonn and Leipzig. Kurt Schroeder, 1929). Chapter V is especially useful.

⁴ See Roucek, *op. cit.*, pp. 434-439.

HISTORY OF THE REGION

Before 1918. While Poland and Lithuania had had distinguished histories as independent states prior to World War I, neither Estonia nor Latvia had ever been free. Poland and Lithuania appeared as two separate European powers about the year 1000. The Teutonic Knights of the Sword, invited by the Poles to help them in their conflicts with the early Prussians (the Slavic aborigines who were exterminated by the Teutonic Knights) occupied Pomerania and from there moved northward into the Baltic region. They took Estonia and subsequently captured Danzig. Meanwhile, in the late fourteenth century, Lithuania and Poland entered into a dynastic union, when the Polish Queen Hedvig married the Lithuanian Duke Jagello. In 1410, the combined armies of the Lithuanians and Poles defeated the Teutonic Knights at Tannenberg Forest. During the sixteenth century, the two countries extended their combined power until they were the largest state in Europe. Then followed disastrous wars with Sweden and the gradual disruption of the Polish-Lithuanian state. The climax came in the three partitions of Poland and Lithuania, which divided the two countries among Austria, Prussia and Russia at the end of the eighteenth century. Here they remained until 1917 except for a few brief months when Warsaw became a duchy under Napoleon in 1806.

As for Latvia and Estonia, they early fell under the control of the Teutonic Knights. In 1346, the Danes captured part of Estonia while part of Latvia was later taken over by Lithuania. During the sixteenth century, both countries fell under Swedish domination. In 1721, Peter the Great of Russia was able to conquer most of modern Latvia and all of Estonia.⁵

CONSTITUTIONAL BACKGROUND

Poland,⁶ Since 1918. When the Russian Revolution of 1905 occurred, Poland participated in the revolt. It was only one of many efforts which she made during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to gain independence. As revolt after revolt oc-

⁵ Roucek, *op cit.*, Chs. 19 and 20 give satisfactory summaries.

⁶ See Joseph Statkowski, *Poland* (Warsaw: M. Arct, n.d.).

curred they were drastically suppressed by Russia. In 1914, at the outbreak of World War I, the Grand Duke Nicholas of Russia promised Poland autonomy if she would come to Russian aid; but on the 5th of August, 1915, Warsaw was occupied by German armies and Poland was able to help no one, including herself. Efforts at organizing a Polish army subordinate to the supreme German command failed because the Poles were not satisfied with the semi-independence promised them. This led to the arrest of Joseph Pilsudski and to his imprisonment in the fortress at Magdeburg in East Prussia. In an effort to conciliate the Polish element, the German Emperor granted a regency council to the Poles on September 12, 1917, but it lacked authority and had limited range of action. Meanwhile, President Wilson's Fourteen Points were announced to the world, and simultaneously during the year 1917 revolutions broke out in Russia following which the provisional Russian government announced its readiness to recognize an independent Polish state. At the end of World War I, Polish legions were in control of Warsaw. Boundaries were settled by the Treaty of Versailles and peace was brought about in 1921.⁷

The first act of the liberated Joseph Pilsudski in February, 1919, was to convoke a constitutional assembly, which met in Warsaw. The provisional government adopted a new constitution on March 17, 1921, proclaimed the country a Republic, and promised to adhere to democratic principles. On December 14, 1922, Pilsudski gave over his powers as Marshal to President Narutowicz. Meanwhile, friction developed in domestic politics and on November 17, 1925, Pilsudski interceded with President Wojciechowski in behalf of his army. Thereupon, he was appointed Minister of War on May 15, 1926, and in 1927 he became Prime Minister and following that the dictator of Poland.⁸

Lithuania,⁹ Since 1918. As previously noted, Lithuania had long been submerged in the Polish state and had considerable difficulty in reestablishing its national identity. It took part in the Russian revolt of 1905 and a number of its leaders met in conference to agitate for independence. One of the most important of these conferences was the Second Seimas in Vilna, 1917,

⁷ See Raymond Leslie Buell, *Poland: Key to Europe* (New York: Knopf, 1939).

⁸ See W. F. Reddaway, *Marshal Pilsudski* (London: Routledge, 1939).

⁹ See E. J. Harrison, *Lithuania, 1928* (London: Hazell, Watson and Viney, 1928).

when that area was occupied by German troops. The Second Seimas discussed Lithuanian independence and set up a council or Taryba, to seek independence from Russia. Independence was announced February 16, 1918, but it was some time before it was actually secured and a new government established. The treaty of peace of Riga, July 12, 1920, laid down the boundaries. Lithuania was resurrected after four hundred years of rule by foreign powers.

In 1920, the provisional Lithuanian government was driven out of Vilna by the Polish General Zeligowski, and was forced to move to Kaunas where the constitutional assembly or Seimas was convoked. It ratified unanimously the Declaration of Independence and proceeded to draft a constitution, after enacting land reform laws. On August 1, 1922, the Constitution was formally adopted. It continued the Seimas in power, giving that body rule over the whole country. On December 17, 1926, the Constitution was overhauled, and again on May 15, 1928, it was made even more conservative than it had been before. By that time Antanas Smetona had become the dictator and the Constitution was built about his rule.¹⁰

The Taryba, set up in 1917, immediately organized itself in the council of Lithuania, and when it recreated the Lithuanian state, it took over the duties of the first cabinet and selected the new President, the first provisional President of Lithuania.¹¹ This provisional arrangement continued until the first regular constitutional convention was convened in 1920. Aleksandras Stulginskis was the speaker of the first Constitutional Assembly, and later became the President of Lithuania. Dr. Kazys Grinius became his Prime Minister. The form of government established was a republic.

Estonia,¹² Since 1918. In 1905, the Estonians revolted unsuccessfully against the Russians. When the revolutions of 1917 occurred, the Estonians at last found their chance for independence, and seized it. A group in Tallinn on July 14, 1917, announced its intention of setting up a free Estonia. Later a duly elected Diet declared Estonia an independent democratic republic on Feb.

¹⁰ See P. Zadeikis, *Introducing Lithuania* (New York: Lithuanian Government, 1933).

¹¹ *Statesman's Yearbook*, 1939 (London, Macmillan, 1939), p. 1128.

¹² See Albert Pullerits, *Estonia* (Tallinn: Kirjastus Uhisuse Trukikoda, 1937).

24, 1918. Military occupation by German forces temporarily terminated freedom of Estonian action, but on Nov. 11, 1918, this was restored, whereupon the Estonian army fought against the Bolshevik and freebooter forces. The U.S.S.R. recognized Estonian independence in the Treaty of Tartu or Dorpat with Russia on February 2, 1920.

A constitution was adopted on June 15, 1920, based on democratic principles which placed the power over the government in the hands of the people, including therein provisions for the initiative and referendum and other similar progressive measures. In the elections of October 14-16, 1933, the President was given dictatorial powers in order to combat a hostile parliament.

Latvia,¹³ Since 1918. Latvia began the struggle for independence in 1903 with an autonomy movement formulated by Latvian revolutionaries in Switzerland. This was followed in 1904 and 1905 by the Latvian Revolutionary Federative Committee taking part in organizing an armed militia. In 1915, the Latvian rifle regiments were already in operation and in 1917 when Russia granted the Latvians restricted self-government, the Latvians demanded independence. After the October, 1917, Revolution in Russia, a provisional national committee was established in Walk. On November 18, 1917, a formal resolution was adopted declaring Latvia free from Russia.

On November 11, 1918, Latvia was accorded recognition by the major powers. The Latvian State Council was formed that month with Karlis Ulmanis as Prime Minister. A constituent assembly was elected in 1920 and passed the agrarian reform bill. On June 30, 1922, a constitution was adopted establishing Latvia as a republic. It paved the way for the election of a parliament which met on November 7 of the same year.

*Under Germany and the U.S.S.R.*¹⁴ In September, 1939, Germany attacked Poland, and in seven short weeks terminated her existence as an independent state. At the same time Russia moved in to share in the fourth partition and the two countries divided the territory and spoils between them. In September and October Russia, with German approval, forced the three Baltic States to accept Soviet garrisons in strategic points. Soon afterward the Russian forces dissolved the governments and parliaments in

¹³ Alfred Bihlmans, *Latvia in the Making* (Riga: Times Edition, 1928).

¹⁴ See *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXXII (March, 1944), pp. 24-60.

all three republics and supervised mock elections which produced Communist-controlled regimes. These puppet governments then applied for admission to the Soviet Union, and Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia were incorporated in the U.S.S.R. as Soviet Socialist Republics. A thoroughgoing nationalization of industry and private enterprise was instituted. Collective farms were established and such remaining landholdings of extensive proportions as still existed were split among small owners. Meanwhile, such strict censorship was established that very little news leaked out.

When the Germans took over control of these three republics and when they had conquered White Russia, they combined Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and White Russia into one administrative unit known as *Ostland*.¹⁵ Poland was not included. The revolutionary Russian rule was now replaced by an equally harsh German rule. The Germans took over the nationalized property and set up administrative organizations of their own. Provincial governors, with power centralized in their hands, established agencies governing political, strategic, productive, and social activities on Nazi lines.

U.S.S.R. Again. With the defeat of Germany, Russia occupied all four states. In three of these, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, she proceeded with the previously interrupted sovietization. In Poland, Russia set up her own puppet government and induced Britain and the United States to abandon the Polish government in exile in London.

POLISH GOVERNMENT BEFORE THE SECOND WORLD WAR

The President and Cabinet. The continental type of President was set up, and he was aided by a cabinet of ministers, responsible to Parliament. The Cabinet consisted of the President, the Prime Minister, and ministers. The Ministries were Foreign Affairs, Interior, Finance, Trade and Industry, Justice, Education, Agriculture, Land Reform, Social Welfare, Public Work, Post and Telegraph.

The President, Pilsudski, assumed great powers from the out-

¹⁵ *International Labour Review*, XLIX (February, 1944), pp. 171-190.

set and set the stage for ultimate dictatorship. His attitude was summed up in the following quotation:

He (Pilsudski) is the tutor of his country. The constitution exists, but the constitution must prove its worth by functioning. Parliament may discuss: but if Parliament continues to discuss to the neglect of action and remedial measures it knows it will feel the lash of Pilsudski's tongue and perhaps worse.¹⁶

The President could call, open, and prorogue the Sejm. He could make treaties, was the commander of the army in peacetime, and could promulgate laws by special decree when the Sejm was not in session. All important documents had to carry his signature as well as that of the Premier and the cabinet minister concerned. In case the President died, the Speaker of the Sejm carried on the duties and work of the President. The President could dissolve both houses of parliament by decree, provided his cabinet agreed, and a general election was called for. During the period when the election was taking place, the President had the power of legislating by decree. The Constitution provided Polish citizens with a long series of personal freedoms, among other things the freedom of speech, of press and of assembly.

All Polish citizens 41 years of age or more were entitled to vote for the President. Those who were 21 years or more were entitled to vote for members of the Legislature. Soldiers in service were excluded from voting.

*The Sejm.*¹⁷ The new government, established on March 17, 1921, placed the law-making power in the hands of a bicameral legislature whose members were elected for five-year terms. The upper chamber was known as the Senate and consisted of 111 members; the lower chamber was known as the Sejm and consisted of 444 members. Customary legislative power was vested in this parliament, which was complemented by the President of the Republic, elected for a term of seven years, and a judiciary which was made independent, and protected in that independence by specific statutory guarantees.

Broad constitutional powers were delegated to the Sejm. The Constitution could be amended by a three-fifths majority of the two houses meeting as a national assembly. Parliament was

¹⁶ From Eric J. Patterson, *Pilsudski* (London: Philip Allan, 1934), p. 27.

¹⁷ See Statkowski, *op. cit.*

required to convene every 25 years in order to consider whether the Constitution was still in accordance with the requirements of the time. In such an assembly only a majority vote was needed to change the basic law. For ordinary legislative purposes the customary practice of dividing both houses into committees was followed.

As seen elsewhere, the prestige of the presidency and its power to initiate legislation soon led to a decline in the importance and strength of the Sejm, and to the predominance of the executive.

*Parties.*¹⁸ One of the principal reasons for the downfall of Poland at the end of the eighteenth century was the disagreement among the Polish people themselves and it seemed very much as though this were about to be repeated when Poland regained her independence in 1918. It was the strong hand of Piłsudski alone which saved Poland from this internal disruption. As a reflection of this particularism there were twelve parties represented in the Senate, the Non-Partisan group being by far the strongest. There were 21 parties represented in the Sejm, and again the Non-Partisan bloc was easily the strongest. The principal parties were: the Nationalist Party, the Peasant Party, the Socialists, the Ukrainians, the Christian Democrats, the National Labor, the Jewish Minority Party, German Minority, Communists, Ukrainian Radicals, Jewish Orthodox Party, the Peasant Self-Help Party, and the Independents. These ranged all the way from the conservative National Peoples Union to the radical Communists.

The Non-Partisan group consisted of former legionnaires and pro-government elements. Among them were the Democrats, Radicals and Socialists. They demanded a stronger executive. The Nationalist Party, or the National Democrats, sought a balance between the executive and legislative powers, and was composed of well-to-do merchants, landowners, professional people, and bourgeoisie. The Peasant Party combined into the Peasant Union, the Radical Peasant Party, and the Peasant Party proper. The group consisted of small landowners and farm hands, who sought the expropriation of church property. Socialists were the oldest Polish political party, with a program going back as far as the Second International. They were small farm holders and farm workers. Ukrainians and Germans were national minorities

¹⁸ *Poland's New Codes of Law*, No. 3 of Birmingham University Slavonic Department, 1936-1940.

content with developing their own interests. The Jewish Orthodox Party was different from other Jewish groups in that it opposed Zionism. Then there were the Christian Democrats following the lead of the church, the National Labor Party, Patriotic Party, and the Communists who were a Polish section of the Third International.

Judiciary. As it finally developed prior to World War II, the Polish judiciary was headed by one Supreme Court, which in its different capacities consisted of 81 justices. The 45 Circuit Courts were courts of first instance, and there were 7 courts of appeal. Besides these there were 550 Courts of Peace (Justice of Peace Courts) and 17 Labour Courts. All except the last had both criminal and civil jurisdiction.¹⁹

Local Government. The country was divided, for local administrative purposes, into 16 provinces (*Wojewodztwo*) which were subdivided into 275 counties (*Starostwo*). The counties were presided over by a Dietine (*Sejmik*) presided over by the district chief (*Starosta*). Local autonomy had only just begun its operation in 1939. The Polish part of Upper Silesia had a basic law of its own and a Diet and a special government of its own.

*Recent Developments.*²⁰ When Poland was conquered by Germany in 1939, Poland was divided for the fourth time between Russia and Germany. German Poland was incorporated into the National Socialist state, while Russian Poland was amalgamated into the Russian state. When the Germans drove the Russians out of Poland, they extended their rule to cover the newly occupied Russian section. Meanwhile, an independent government in exile was set up in London and a Polish army was organized under its own banners as an ally of the United Nations.²¹ In the campaigns in North Africa and on the continent of Europe, Polish soldiers on land, sea and in the air fought with the Allies. In 1944, a group of Polish soldiers had been organized into units under Russian leadership and when the Germans were driven out of Warsaw they entered upon control and occupation of the city.²² But peace did not come with victory.

¹⁹ *Concise Statistical Year Book of Poland, 1933* (Warsaw: Bureau of Statistics), pp. 150-154.

²⁰ See Roucek, *op. cit.*; Thorsten V. Kalijarvi and associates, *Modern World Politics* (New York: Crowell, 1942), pp. 682-683.

²¹ See Thaddeus Mitana, "Poland Among the Powers," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXXII (March, 1944), pp. 52-60.

²² See X, "Russia and Germany," *Foreign Affairs*, XX (January, 1942) pp. 303-343.

The Struggle for Power. The Polish government in exile, with headquarters in London during the war, became dependent upon, and worked in close cooperation with, Great Britain and the United States. Since the government in exile included elements hostile to Russian plans, the Soviet Government undertook to prevent its return to Poland at the end of hostilities. A rival Polish provisional government, dominated by Communists, was established under Soviet auspices at Lublin. After the Red Army drove the Germans out of Poland, it moved to Warsaw and assumed the governing powers. It justified this action on the ground that the Polish Constitution of 1935, from which the government in exile derived its powers, did not express the democratic aspirations of the Polish people. It therefore proclaimed the 1921 Constitution as being again in force.²³

Yalta Agreement. The rivalry between the Polish governments in Warsaw and London ended in victory for the Warsaw regime as a result of an agreement made by Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference in February, 1945. The three affirmed their desire "to see created a strong, free, independent and democratic Poland" and agreed that the Warsaw regime "should be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad." Under pressure of the Big Three, some members of the Polish government in exile agreed after long negotiation to accept membership in a reorganized Warsaw government. This new Government of National Unity was proclaimed June 28, 1945, with members of the Soviet-sponsored provisional government holding 16 of the 21 Cabinet posts.

The Russian protégés, Boleslaw Bierut, Edward Osobka-Morawski and Wladyslaw Gomulka, retained their previous positions as President, Premier and Vice Premier respectively in the Government of National Unity, while another Vice Premier was added in the person of Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, leader of the Polish Peasant Party, who had been a member of the government in exile. Britain and the United States now withdrew their support of the government in exile, which had rejected Russian territorial demands on Poland, and extended recognition to the Government of National Unity. Recognition was made conditional upon the holding of free elections during 1946 in which

²³ See Ignace Zlotowski, *What Is Happening in Poland* (New York: American Polish Labor Council, June 1945).

"equal rights and facilities" would be given to all democratic and anti-Nazi parties. At the Potsdam Conference in July and August, 1945, the heads of the British and American governments agreed provisionally to Polish demands, backed by Moscow, for the cession to Poland of all former German territories east of the Oder and Western Neisse Rivers with the exception of the Koenigsberg area ceded to Russia.

The Elections. In advance of the elections that were designed to confirm the authority of the Government of National Unity, the Soviet-controlled leaders of the government undertook to organize all of the parties represented therein in a National Unity bloc which would give the voters the sole choice of accepting or rejecting the candidates presented on a single ticket. Under strong pressure from the government, most of the recognized Polish parties²⁴ entered the bloc, but Mikolajczyk and his powerful Polish Peasant Party refused. In deliberate violation of the pledges of free elections made by the government, it proceeded systematically to undermine and crush the Polish Peasant Party by intrigue, violence and intimidation. Repeated protests by the United States and British governments went unheeded. The result was that the referendum of June 30, 1946, and the parliamentary elections of January 19, 1947, gave Soviet-controlled elements complete domination of the Warsaw government and of Poland.

In the referendum, in which thirteen million votes were cast, the voters abolished the Senate; approved agrarian reforms and the nationalization of the chief industries; and consented to annexation of German territory as far west as the Oder and the Neisse.²⁵ The official government returns for the January, 1947, elections announced that the government bloc polled some 11,245,000 votes to only 1,155,000 for the Polish Peasant Party. Foreign observers were almost unanimous in reporting that the Polish Peasant Party would have rolled up a substantial majority in a free and fair election. The National Unity bloc, however, captured 383 of the 440 seats in the newly elected Assembly.

Cession to Russia. The Potsdam Conference was followed by the final delimitation of the new Polish-Russian frontier in a treaty signed in Moscow August 16, 1945. The new frontier ran with some changes, along the Curzon Line and transferred to the

²⁴ "Poland at Home and Abroad," *Poland of Today*, I (April, 1946), pp. 13-16.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, I (August, 1946), pp. 12-14.

Soviet Union 69,860 square miles of Polish territory with a population estimated at 10,772,000.²⁷ In partial compensation Poland annexed 38,986 square miles of former German territory on the west.

Character of the New Government. While Poland, therefore, still had the government set up by the Constitutions of 1921 and 1935, the trend of her National Unity Government was toward the single-party pattern. The Senate had been voted away. The economy was being "organized along planned lines representing both capitalism and socialism."²⁸ Large-scale industry was being made a state enterprise. The social structure of Polish agriculture had been revolutionized. Foreign policy was coordinated with that of the Russian-dominated Slavic bloc.²⁹ Labor battalions were organized under the title of "Polish Resettlement Corps" to work on rehabilitation.³⁰ Thus, while the transition from the prewar to the new postwar governments was not complete, the pattern was obvious.

PREWAR GOVERNMENTS OF LITHUANIA, ESTONIA, AND LATVIA

The President and Cabinet. The Lithuanian President, elected for a term of seven years by an electoral college, ratified treaties concluded with foreign governments, appointed and discharged ministers, promulgated laws, and ruled the government by decree between sessions of the legislature. He was assisted by a cabinet which consisted of a premier and eight ministers.³¹

The Estonian constitution³² of 1933 set up a President elected by direct vote of the people for a term of five years, thus making him representative of the people and not of the legislature. He was the executive head of the state and shared on more than an

²⁷ Ignace Zlotowski, *What Is Happening in Poland* (New York: American Polish Labor Council, June, 1945), p. 12.

²⁸ "Poland's Economic Organization," *Poland of Today*, I (September, 1946), pp. 3-4.

²⁹ Oscar Lange, "Poland's Foreign Policy," *Poland of Today*, I (March, 1946), pp. 4-5.

³⁰ *Polish Facts and Figures*, XII (September 5, 1946), pp. 1, 4.

³¹ See Zadeikis, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-30.

³² *The Constitution of Estonian Republic*, official ed. (Tallinn: State Printing Office, 1937).

equal basis the supreme political power with the Riigikogu or Parliament.

The President's duties were to direct home affairs, control the foreign policy of the state, represent the Estonian Republic, appoint representatives to foreign countries, supervise the administration, submit the budget to the State Assembly, appoint the higher officers in the civil and military services, conclude treaties, declare war, enter into peace terms with the cooperation or in collaboration with the State Assembly, grant pardons, veto acts of the legislature, and appoint members of the courts of justice. He was commander-in-chief of the armed forces, mobilized the military and naval power without reference to parliament, could promulgate and draft laws with full power, was bound only by being unable to modify popular referenda or initiative measures of the State Assembly. All other laws he could effect by presidential decree.

The central administration³³ was placed in the hands of the President, the Prime Minister, the state Chancery, and the ministries of Education, Social Affairs, Defense, Justice, Economic Affairs, Agriculture, Interior Communications, and Foreign Affairs.

The Latvian administration consisted of the customary premier and cabinet. The President was elected for a three-year term, had to be forty years of age and was disqualified from holding office more than six consecutive years. In cases where the President and Parliament could not agree, the President had the power to dissolve Parliament and when defeated at elections he had to resign, in which case the speaker of the Seima took over in his place.³⁴

Parliament. The Lithuanian Seimas or Parliament also acted as a constitutional assembly. But the parliamentary system did not have a real chance in Lithuania.³⁵ In spite of compulsory free education, guarantees of freedom for all religious parties, popular participation in the making of the constitution, and provisions for a popular referendum, the Lithuanian government failed to achieve stability. The last Seimas was dismissed in 1927.

³³ See Pullerits, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-29.

³⁴ James K. Pollock, "The Constitution of Latvia," *The American Political Science Review*, XVII (August, 1923), pp. 446-448.

³⁵ See P. Zadeikis, "An Aspect of the Lithuanian Record of Independence," *The Annals*, CCXXXII (March, 1944), pp. 49-51.

On Dec. 11, 1931, President Smetona was reelected for a term of seven years following a military overthrow of the preceding administration.

The new Estonian constitution of 1933 set up a State Assembly³⁶ consisting of 50 members elected by universal, equal, direct and secret voting, permitting voting for an individual candidate rather than for a list. The term of office was four years, and the President could dissolve the Assembly at his pleasure, thus terminating the legislature before its full span of years had run. He could also convoke the Assembly in extraordinary session, for the President exercised an absolute suspensive veto. He could refuse to promulgate laws passed by the State Assembly and re-submit them for deliberation. There were a great many controls which placed the State Assembly completely under his control. The President and his ministers were the government of Estonia.

The Latvian constitution proclaimed Latvia a republic with the sovereign power resting in the hands of the people of the state. The constitution provided in Section 2 for a single-chambered parliament or Seima consisting of 102 representatives chosen by proportional representation by universal direct secret suffrage for men and women over 21 years of age.

The initiative and referendum were provided for all national laws except those covering budgets, treaties, mobilization, taxes, loans, customs, Jews, military service, war and peace. The people could initiate constitutional amendments, and an independent judiciary was provided.

In theory the great political freedom guaranteed in the constitution through the system of proportional representation, and through the initiative and referendum should have provided a stable government.³⁷ Unfortunately, it did not work out that way, for as a rule the Seima was composed of some twenty different parties. In 1934, Karlis Ulmanis and his party were directed to draft a new constitution but had not done so when Latvia lost her independence.

Parties. Political parties were ineffective, especially in the face of drastic presidential action. In Lithuania the leading parties were the People's Social Party, representing the agricultural classes; a strong Social Democratic Party, which stood for a con-

³⁶ See Johannes Klesmet, "Reform of Estonian Constitution," *Revue Baltique* (February, 1940), pp. 54-67.

³⁷ See Roucek, *op. cit.*, pp. 441-443.

stitutional socialistic program; the Christian Democratic Party, to which the Roman Catholic clergy belonged; the Farmers Union, the Federation of Labor, Memel Territory Party, Polish Minority, Jewish Party, Nationalist Union, Farmers Party, and German Minority Party.

In Estonia prior to the modification of the original constitution in 1933, Parliament consisted of 100 members, divided chiefly into the following parties: the Agrarian, representing the farmers and land owners; the Socialist, representing the working class; the Settlers, representing the peasants who had received land under the agrarian reform of 1919; the Labor, representing small landowners and non-socialists; the Nationalists; the Workers, the more radical socialists; the Christian Nationalists, representing clerical interests; and the national minorities, such as the Russians and Germans. These were the parties which in their disagreement finally produced the dictatorship.

The Latvian Parliament was divided into 26 different parties which could be classed into the right, left, center and minority groups. In general, the rightists included the wealthier peasants and the urban middle class from whom they drew their membership, and they worked toward closer collaboration with the neighboring Baltic States. The leftists, on the other hand, were sympathetic toward Soviet Russia and looked askance upon closer relationships with Poland. The Communists grew steadily stronger while the minorities were scattered.

The single parties were the Social Democratic Party (Labor) which was affiliated with the Second International; the Peasant Union, drawn from well-to-do farmers and landowners, who advocated a close economic union with Estonia and Lithuania, and an alliance among all the Baltic States and Poland including also a close cooperation with the British-led groups; the Latgalian, Catholic and Christian Peasant Party which represented the Catholic population of Latgallia; a substantial German minority, a strong Communist minority, the Jewish minority, the small landowners, the International Union, the Democratic Center, the Latgallian Democratic Peasants, the Progressives, the National Union, the Polish Catholic Party, and the Reform Social Democrats. These were the most important parties but do not exhaust the list. This multiple party system resembled that of pre-war France and pre-dictator Germany and Italy.

Judiciary. In Lithuania the courts of first instance were justices

of peace and these were located in precincts. Over these were the circuit courts, and finally above all these was the Supreme Court as the final court of appeals. On the whole, the courts were autonomous and the customary protection for judges was provided. Lithuania was divided into five judicial circuits: Klaipėda, Kaunas, Šiauliai, Mariampolė, and Panevėžys.

The Estonian judiciary was independent and autonomous. Justices were appointed by the President, and the branches of the judicature were independent of each other. At the head was the State Court with its seat in Tallinn. It controlled all law courts, dismissed judges, had final word in appeals on criminal, civil and administrative cases, and had its own prosecutors controlled by the Minister of Justice. There was also a court of appeal at Tallinn, and under this the regional courts in four parts of the country. The courts of first instance were the district magistrates who tried criminal, civil and administrative cases.

The judiciary of Latvia was similar to that of the other states described in this chapter. Courts of first instance were the justices of peace. Above them were four district courts from which cases could be carried to the Court of Appeals. The highest court was the Seima, before its disbandment on May 16, 1934. The old Baltic provincial law was continued in force after independence was achieved, and Russian law in Latgallia. However, Russian occupation in 1939 set up Soviet control.

Local Government. Lithuania was divided into twenty-four counties (*Apskritis*), sub-divided into communities (*Valseius*) and townships (*Seniunijs*). Cities, communities, and counties possessed elective councils and exercised considerable local autonomy. Klaipėda,³⁸ or the territory of Memel, was divided into three separate counties.

Estonian local government was centralized and constituted a part of the state administration. There were eleven provinces, each subdivided into large towns, boroughs, and rural communes. In the towns, the mayor was the administrative head; in the provinces, the president; in the communes, the sheriff. There were the customary departments of administration, finance, education, sanitation, labor, public welfare and communications. Groups of towns and municipalities formed leagues for the purpose of carrying into effect programs of economic and educational

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-34.

well being. There was actually a league of provinces when the Russians moved in.

However, notwithstanding all of this detail there were only two fundamental administrative divisions in Estonia: (1) the towns, and (2) the provinces. There were 18 towns and 11 provinces. The provinces had 369 rural communes and 17 boroughs.

For administrative purposes Latvia was divided into four districts of Vidzeme (Livonia), Kurzeme (Courland), Zemgale and Latgale. These in their turn were divided into town and rural communes similar to those of Estonia.

Recent Developments. In 1940, all three countries were incorporated into the Soviet state under a pretended autonomy. With the defeat of Germany, Russia reoccupied them and again incorporated them into the Russian Soviet State.

When in August, 1939,³⁹ Germany and Russia reached their fateful pact of mutual assistance, Russia was given a free hand in the Baltic States, and by the so-called pact of mutual assistance between Estonia and Russia in October, 1939, Russia took control of Estonia. She had dominated it for only nine months when she lost it to the Germans. Latvia's fate was similar.⁴⁰

Thus today these three Baltic States are single party, communized, centralized, Soviet-dominated states. All the governmental panoply and paraphernalia of Russia, including propaganda, people's courts, nationalized property, disregard for human values, and participation in Russian socio-politico-economic system is theirs.

RECENT TRENDS

Poland. The year 1947 saw the Communists openly seize control of the Polish government. They successfully opposed the efforts of the Democratic Bloc to re-establish social and religious stability by writing a guarantee of protection for the Catholic Church into the new constitution. They blasted the hopes of all other parties for moderation in the election of January 19, which was preceded by Communist intimidation and coercion exercised

³⁹ See Johannes Kaiv, "Estonian Nationalism," *The Annals*, CCXXXII (March, 1944), pp. 39-42.

⁴⁰ For recent events see Alfred Bilmanis, "Free Latvia in Free Europe," *The Annals* CCXXXII (March, 1944), pp. 43-48.

against all non-Communists in open violation of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. For tactical and strategic reasons they joined the Socialists and founded the so-called Government Bloc with the following results in the election of January 19:

Socialists and Communists	383
Peasants	27
Work Party	17
Dissident Peasant Party	13
Catholics	3
Independents	1

On January 22 it was announced that the Communists and Socialists were entitled to 119 seats and the Peasant Party to 106. Both the United States and Britain protested the elections.

During the election the Peasant Party had been a special subject of violence because it alone possessed sufficient strength to be a danger to the Communists. The pre-election violence turned to post-election persecution, and on October 20, the Peasant leader, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, fled to London and from there to the United States in December. On November 16, Josef Niecko took over control of the Peasant Party and began its reorganization.

The Presidency was held by Boleslaw Bierut, who was elected to that office on April 7. Naturally the Cabinet too was Communist controlled and internal security and police power were vested in the hands of the Communist Gomulka. A six man State Council was established with powers superior to those of the Sejm, and when the latter was called into session on April 15 to consider the new budget, it had lost most of its powers. On April 25, as part of the evolution of the new Polish police state, a two month political amnesty was proclaimed and brought out of hiding 50,000 members of the underground. Mass deportations of Germans were renewed, spy trials flared up, and war criminal trials were continued throughout the year.

The Polish Communists obviously were acting under orders from Moscow. How close were the ties with the U.S.S.R. was made clear on October 5, when the new Cominform was organized at a conference held on Polish soil. In other ways too the close ties with Moscow were constantly revealed. On April 9, at a conference of the Foreign Ministers, Molotov insisted that the Polish boundaries had already been fixed by the Potsdam agreement, that they were meant to be permanent, and that the role of the

peace conference was merely to ratify them. At one time the Polish Communists did not follow Moscow wishes clearly enough, for although they were reported to be in favor of cooperation in the conference in July on European recovery, Poland on second thought rejected the opportunity to participate in the Marshall Plan. Under Soviet guidance Poland called for drastic action by the United Nations against Spain. Time and time again Poland stood as the U.S.S.R. front in the United Nations.

The Baltic States. Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia rapidly discovered the meaning of membership in the Soviet Union. The Iron Curtain makes it hard to determine in detail what has happened; but information which leaks out indicates that the last vestiges of opposition to communism are being wiped out. During 1947, Soviet Russia demanded the return of the displaced persons of Baltic origin, presumably for liquidation. Meanwhile the Baltic economy was integrated into that of the Soviet. The United States and several other countries still continued to recognize the Baltic representatives as officials of their countries, thus refusing to acquiesce in the Russian conquest.

Reports reached the outside world of mass deportations of the Balts into Central Asia and the transplanting of thousands of other Russian peoples in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. For a distance of fifty kilometers or more, Russia evacuated the people from the coastline and established a security zone from which everyone except military personnel was excluded.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Poland and the Baltic states were drawn into the Russian orbit of power and their security, economy, and political systems were integrated into those of the U.S.S.R. The unity of the police state was forced upon unwilling Baltic populations, by force where necessary. Recent rumors state that an international underground of Polish and Baltic refugees is being organized to fight Soviet Russia throughout the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baltic States: Survey of the Political and Economic Structure and the Foreign Relations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (London:

- Oxford University Press, 1938). Contains a wealth of reliable information and interpretation.
- Baltic States Handbook* (London: Chatham House, 1938).
- BILMANIS, ALFRED, *Latvia in the Making, 1918-1928* (Riga: Riga Times Ed., 1928). Excellent introduction to the subject of Latvian government.
- Books on Poland* (Supplement to the *Polish Review*) (New York: Polish Govt. Info. Center, 745 Fifth Ave., 1944). Best bibliography on Poland.
- BRANT, IRVING, *The New Poland* (New York: Universal Publishers, 1946). A helpful and authoritative summary.
- BUELL, R. L., *Poland: Key to Europe* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1939). An excellent introduction.
- FROME, MICHAEL, *Uncensored Picture of Poland Today* (reprints from *Washington Post*, June 2 through June 6, 1946). Brief, terse, sympathetic.
- GRAHAM, MALBONE W., *New Government of Eastern Europe* (New York: Holt, 1927). Useful background for early part of this chapter.
- HARRISON, E. J., *Lithuania, 1928* (London: Hazell, Watson and Viney, 1928). Well written and authoritative.
- HUMPHREY, GRACE, *Poland Today* (Warsaw: M. Arct, 1935). Short, understanding.
- KALIJARVI, THORSTEN V., *The Memel Statute* (London: Robert Hale, 1937). Extended treatment.
- KARSKI, STEFAN, *Poland Past and Present* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1933). Well written, short yet comprehensive.
- LANE, ARTHUR BLISS, *I Saw Poland Betrayed* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1948). The former American Ambassador's personal account of his year-and-a-half mission to Poland, which was concluded with his resignation after the Polish elections of January, 1947; he condemns Soviet treatment of the country and the indifference of Britain and the United States.
- New Poland*, a monthly periodical in English. See especially Vol. 1, No. 6 (August, 1946) and Vol. 1, No. 7 (September, 1946).
- PATTERSON, ERIC J., *Pilsudski* (London: Philip Allan, 1934). Short and precise.
- Poland of Today*. A monthly periodical first published in March, 1946. It has much useful information in English.
- Poland Progress in 1945* (Washington, Library of Polish Embassy, 1945). Helpful birdseye view.
- Polish Facts and Figures*. Another monthly issued by the Polish Embassy in London.
- PULLERITS, ALBERT, *Estonia, Population, Cultural and Economic Life* (Tallinn: Kirjastus Uhisuse Trukikoda, 1937). A most reliable and useful volume.

- ROUCEK, JOSEPH, ed., *Central Eastern Europe* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946). Chapters XVIII, XX, XXI. Excellent summary.
- , ed., *Contemporary Europe* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1941). Excellent.
- URCH, R. O. G., *Latvia, Country and People* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1938). Readable and informative.
- WANKLYN, H. G., *The Eastern Marchlands of Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1942).
- Warsaw Accuses* (New York: Polish Embassy). The story of Warsaw in words and pictures.
- WINIEWICZ, J. M., *The Polish-German Frontier* (London: William Hodge and Company, 1945). A defense of the present frontier.
- ZADEIKIS, P., *Introducing Lithuania* (New York: Lithuanian Government, 1933). As good a recent summary as can be found in English.
- ZLOTOWSKI, IGNACE, *What Is Happening in Poland* (New York: American Polish Labor Council, 1945). An explanation of present conditions.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Between World Wars I and II, Czechoslovakia was an outstanding example of the state trying to apply America's principles of democracy to politics. It was a parliamentary democracy, whose Constitution took as a model principally the constitutions of France and of the United States, adapting them to the special conditions of the country. Both Houses were elected by popular vote, but, in contrast to the practice of the United States, the President of the Republic was elected by both Houses sitting in a joint session. President Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the George Washington of his country, dominated the political scene until his voluntary resignation in December, 1935, after serving 17 years. He was succeeded by Dr. Eduard Beneš, who had been his companion in the struggle for independence and after serving as Minister of Foreign Affairs, became his successor. Beneš served during the Munich crisis, and as President of his country, had to witness the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. After escaping to England and the United States, he organized his government-in-exile, which eventually returned to Czechoslovakia under the sponsorship of the Soviet armies.

Masaryk and Beneš held office over a longer term than any statesmen in Europe during or since World War I, a fact which gave the Republic unusual stability of policy in its formative years. The President appointed the Cabinet of Ministers, who were responsible to Parliament for detailed conduct of government. Following the French system of government, Cabinet Ministers were required to appear in Parliament and committees to answer interpellations, to defend their policies and bills. Although the French Cabinet was obligated to resign in case any of its more important measures were defeated and disavowed by Parliament, this did not happen under the Czechoslovak Republic. Instead, the Cabinet was reorganized when required by a realignment of the government coalition, one party or another withdrawing when it disagreed with coalition policy. There

were 11 Cabinets during the 20 years, but only 7 Prime Ministers. There were 14 parties represented in the last (pre-Munich) Parliament; this had the great advantage of providing direct representation for every class interest and shade of national opinion. Neither the United States nor Great Britain has an agrarian party, for instance, nor the former even a Labor Party. The Constitution provided for proportional representation, which was rigidly enforced at each election. But voting was not for individual candidates, but for lists of various parties. Since no party has ever commanded a majority in Parliament, it has always been necessary for a coalition of the several parties to form a Cabinet.

During World War II, Czechoslovakia, under the domination of the Nazis longer than any other country (except Austria), reorganized her political system. While Beneš included in his government-in-exile the main political forces from the personalities able to escape from the Nazis, after his return to Prague, he had to face a showdown between democracy and communism in 1946. At that time, 14 million Czechs with a strong democratic heritage had arrived at a situation in which democracy and communism had to make the attempt to live together. In that year, a new government, with a communist Premier and Communists in five key Cabinet posts, assumed command. An industrial system that had achieved marked success in a capitalist democracy was struggling to function effectively under state control. The directors of foreign trade, like the makers of foreign policy, were under orders to look chiefly toward Russia. What already had taken place by 1946 in the nation that Woodrow Wilson had inspired amounted to a revolution. Decrees of a coalition government, acting in the absence of an elected Parliament, plunged the country deep into a planned economy similar to that of Russia, especially by authorizing nationalization and collectivization. In the elections of May 26, 1946, the Czech Communists won 31.15 per cent of the votes and emerged as the strongest single party in the country. The result was generally regarded as reflecting the approval of the policies of the government of the National Front by the electorate. It indicated that these policies, including the transfer of the German minority into Germany, the nationalization of key industries, and development of social legislation, would be continued by the National Front government.

GEOPOLITICAL POSITION

The geographical center of Europe is Bohemia, and Czechoslovakia has often been called its heart. In shape Czechoslovakia resembles a long wedge with the thick end to the west and the thin end to the East. To be exactly in the center of Europe has meant to be involved in the *mêlée* of central Europe's history. No collision of nationalities, of cultures, of ideas has spared this area. Here in the eighth century stood the Eastern bulwark of Roman culture, and here, in the twentieth century, just as a thousand years ago, the Eastern and Western churches came into contact. Here, too, arose the Reformation, and on this soil broke out the war between southern Catholicism and northern Protestantism—a struggle which practically exterminated the nation and swept its culture away.

The Czechoslovak state arose through a restoration of their ancient independence to the lands of the Bohemian Crown—Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia—and the incorporation of Slovak territory. Historically, the Bohemian basin represents a great fortress which has defended the Danubian basin against pressure from the north-west, and also the north-west of central Europe against pressure from the south and the south-east. Protected on all sides by frontier mountains it maintained, via Moravia, connection with the East and with the Hungarian basin. It was Bismarck who made the famous statement: "Whoever is master of Bohemia is master of Europe." In 1866 it was demonstrated that whoever is master of Bohemia has also a free road to the middle Danube via the Moravian Gateway.

In more recent times, Czechoslovakia stood in the way of the plans of Germany's masters, who, under Kaiser Wilhelm II and then under Hitler, tried to conquer the "transversal Eurasian axis," the shortest connection overland between the Atlantic Ocean (North Sea) and the Indian Ocean (Persian Gulf). The Kaiser almost got what he wanted. In World War II, Adolf Hitler made much the same dream his own and also nearly got what he wanted. Hitler's initial success was due to the inability of the people like Neville Chamberlain, the British Prime Minister, to understand the geopolitical importance of Czechoslovakia. The culminating point of this ignorance was reached in Chamberlain's statement regarding the Czechoslovak crisis in 1938: "How terrible, fantastic, incredible it is that we should be digging

trenches and trying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing." Yet, it was Munich which led directly to World War II.

Economics. Czechoslovakia's resources make her one of the richest regions in Europe. Her metallurgical and mining industries are larger than those of Italy, and her heavy industries produced more in 1937 than those of all the eleven eastern European states together, excluding Russia.

Population. There existed a fairly equal division of the population as to occupations: 35 per cent lived by industry and crafts; 35 per cent by agriculture, forestry or fisheries; 13 per cent by commerce, transportation and finance; 17 per cent by the professions and public service.

Minorities. One of the nation's greatest problems was the question of minorities. While more than 70 per cent of its population consisted of Czechs, Slovaks and Carpatho-Russians who are Slavs and closely akin ethnologically, there were before the German invasion of 1939, 3,300,000 Germans, 719,000 Magyars (Hungarians) and 100,000 Poles. The Germans were largely concentrated in the mountainous fringes of Bohemia and Moravia, the Hungarians in southern Slovakia.

The majority of the population—75 per cent—was Catholic, the rest Protestant.

HISTORY

In about the sixth century A.D. the Czechs settled in Bohemia. With the fall of the Great Moravian Empire in 903, Slovakia was separated from Bohemia by the invading Magyars whose centuries of domination never succeeded, however, in stamping out the national character. During the tenth century the Czech tribes were gradually united. "Good King Wenceslaus" of the old Christmas carol, a zealous Christian who met a martyr's death, established contacts with the western Christian world. Under Ottokar II (1253-1278), Bohemia expanded by conquest and became one of the most wealthy and powerful nations in Europe. In 1348 Charles University was founded in Prague. John Huss (1373-1415) is the national hero and the national saint of Czechoslovakia as the founder of Protestantism. His execution as a heretic launched the Czechs upon a struggle for national, re-

ligious and social freedom and did much to check the Germanification of the country.

In 1536, when the Bohemian throne fell vacant, Archduke Ferdinand of Austria acquired the crown and from that time on the lands of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia became practically hereditary in the house of Habsburg. A revolution against the Habsburg Emperor led to the Battle of the White Mountain (1618) which the Czech rebels lost. The Bohemian aristocracy was wiped out; all Protestants were exiled or persecuted and their property confiscated. German was introduced as the official language and Catholicism as the national religion.

During this period, the famous educator, writer and reformer, Comenius—often called the “father of modern education”—was forced to flee the country. After Huss and Masaryk, he is one of the greatest Czech historical figures.

The defeat of the Czechs at the White Mountain meant for them centuries of oppression. Not until the late 18th century, when the ideas of the French Revolution spread eastward, did they regain a national consciousness. Their long struggle for freedom then resolved itself into a striving for basic rights within the framework of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. When war broke out in 1914 the Czechs began to aspire, under the leadership of Masaryk, Beneš and General Stefanik, to complete independence. Masaryk declared his country's independence in Washington, D.C., on Oct. 18, 1918, and ten days later independence was proclaimed in Prague. The provinces of Bohemia and Moravia were united with Slovakia (which had been under Hungary's subjection since the tenth century) and Carpathian Russia (formerly the province of Ruthenia in Hungary).

THE NEW STATE FORM

Czechoslovakia was a parliamentary democracy.¹ Both Houses of Parliament were elected by popular vote: Deputies for a term of six years, Senators for eight. The President of the Republic was elected by both houses sitting in a joint session. His term of office was seven years—and the Constitution permitted only two terms; but an exception was made by law permitting President Masaryk

¹ The text of the Constitution of 1919 can be found in *International Conciliation* (October, 1922), No. 179.

to be reelected as long as he would accept office. Masaryk served 17 years (up to December 1935) before he was succeeded by Beneš.

During the 20 years before World War II Czechoslovakia had only seven Prime Ministers; one of them was a Social Democrat (Tusar), one a Czech Socialist (Beneš), and the last four Agrarians (Svehla, Udrzal, Malypetr, and Hodza).

Voting System. The Constitution provided for proportional representation, which was rigidly enforced at each election, and figured out in a complicated procedure.² Voting was not for individual candidates. The results were bitterly criticized in some quarters of Czechoslovakia. Deputies were recalled from Parliament by their own parties for disobeying party decisions in casting their votes. In fact, parties required a written pledge that the representative would relinquish the seat at the request of the party. This procedure, and the listing of candidates in the order dictated by party discipline put great power in the hands of the party clique or committees.³

Party System. The outstanding characteristic of the Czechoslovak party system, as it functioned between World Wars I and II, was the emphasis placed throughout the political life of Czechoslovakia on the ideological differences of the various party programs which, in most cases reflected also the social and economic currents of the state.⁴

Ideological Politics. It was, consequently, a system of politics which differed widely from that known to the United States. In America the major parties develop their ideological programs from election to election. In Czechoslovakia, on the other hand, the permanent tenets of the parties were worked out extremely carefully at an early stage and were very little, if at all, modified officially during the course of various political changes. This does not mean, however, that there were not frequent deviations in actual politics from the ideological tenets laid down in the official

² For details, see, for instance, Brackett Lewis, *Democracy in Czechoslovakia* (New York: American Friends of Czechoslovakia, 1941), pp. 12-18, for lists of the various parties. "Scratching" in order to vote for candidates of another party was not allowed. Thus a party winning ten seats sent to Parliament the first ten names on its list. If one then resigned or died, the next one on the list was automatically sent to Parliament.

³ For more details, see: J. S. Roucek, "The Working of Czechoslovak Constitutional Democracy," *World Affairs Interpreter*, VIII (July, 1937), pp. 157-167.

⁴ Joseph S. Roucek, "The Czechoslovak Party System," *Journal of Central European Affairs*, I (January, 1942), pp. 428-445.

programs. After all, the supreme law of politics is success. Hence ideologies, as political creeds, are more often weapons giving ethical justifications and revelations giving logical meaning to politics rather than unchangeable tenets for which the practical politicians would be ready to die.⁵ But in Czechoslovakia ideological differences were played up more than anything else in political struggles. A political program meant a system of ideals, presented by a party to the voters as the goal for the realization of which it sought to gain power.

Parties. Foreign observers were always astounded by the number of parties represented in the Czechoslovak Parliament. In 1928, for instance, the population was divided into no fewer than 24 political parties and factions; there were 14 parties represented in the last Parliament. But this large number must be ascribed to the political activities of nationalities and to the desire of the writers of the Constitution to provide direct representation for every class's interest and shade of national opinion. Furthermore, we must remember the separate development of the various parts of the Republic, which also sent their independent party representatives to Parliament. The Slovak and Ruthenian parties were only gradually merging into the corresponding parties in the "historic" (Bohemia-Moravia-Silesia) provinces at the outbreak of World War II.

In general, the Czechoslovak parties were divided into agrarian, bourgeois, and workers' groups; secondly into a conservative-Catholic camp on the one side and a bourgeois-progressive camp on the other; and from a third point of view into socialist and non-socialist parties.⁶

The points of issue between these single groups and camps were principally differences of political programs, and in practical politics cooperation between them was frequent. Since no party ever commanded a majority in Parliament, it was always necessary for a coalition of several parties to form a Cabinet. This had the disadvantage that every measure had to be acceptable to all five or more parties in the coalition at the moment. But the resulting compromises prevented radical changes of policy in

⁵ Cf. Joseph S. Roucek, "Political Behavior as a Struggle for Power," *Journal of Social Philosophy*, VI (1941), pp. 341-351; Roucek, "The Essence of Politics," pp. 3-13, in Roy V. Peel and Joseph S. Roucek; *Introduction to Politics* (New York: Crowell, 1941).

⁶ For their detailed description, see: Joseph S. Roucek, "The Czechoslovak Party System," *Journal for Central European Affairs*, I (January, 1942), pp. 428-445.

public administration and finance, taxation, and import duties. If one party decided to leave the coalition and go into opposition, another was admitted in its place and the resultant change in composition of the Cabinet and in national policy was slightly to the right (conservative) or to the left (liberal). This was one secret of the remarkable stability which characterized the government of Czechoslovakia in comparison with that of France and most other countries in Europe.

Party Strength. The composition of the four Parliaments from 1919 to 1935 was as follows: ⁷

⁷ Based on Brackett Lewis, *Democracy in Czechoslovakia* (New York: American Friends of Czechoslovakia, 1941), pp. 14-15.

	April 1920	November 1925	October 1929	May 1935
CZECHOSLOVAK PARTIES:				
Agrarian ^a	40	46	46	45
Social Democrats ^b	74	29	39	38
Czech Socialist ^c	24	28	32	28
Progressive Socialist	3			
National Democrats ^d	19	13	15	17
National Union			3	
Trades and Crafts.....	6	13	12	17
Czechoslovak Catholic ^e	21	31	25	22
Slovak Catholic ^f	12	23	19	22
Fascist				6
	199	183	191	195
OTHER PARTIES:				
	April 1920	November 1925	October 1929	May 1935
Communist ^g		41	30	30
Sudeten German ^h				44
German Social Democratic	31	17	21	11
" Agrarian	13	24	16	5
" Christian Socialist	9	13	14	6
" Nationalist	12	10	7	
" National Socialist	5	7	8	
" Democratic	2			
" Trades			3	
Hungarian National ⁱ	1		4	
" Christian Socialist ^j	5	4	5	9
Hungarian-German Social Democrats.....	4			
Independent		1	1	
	82	117	109	105

^a Founded 1899; its leader, Antonin Svehla, was Prime Minister 1922-1926 and 1926-1929; died in 1933.

^b The chief workers' party, founded 1878; early members were persecuted by Austria; workingmen obtained the right to vote only in 1896.

The table indicates several general tendencies in the alignment of parties. The Social Democratic (Workers') Party which was overwhelmingly strongest in the first elections, and whose leader, Tusar, was first Premier, lost heavily with the secession of its Marxist wing in 1921 to form the Communist Party. It recovered, however, and was the third largest group in the last Parliament. The Communist Party came out in its first parliamentary elections (1925), the second largest in the country, but later fell to fourth place. The Agrarian Party grew gradually, even after the death of its founder and Premier Svehla, being the largest group in Parliament from 1925. It attracted members from the city population also, both because of its power and its non-socialist policies.

Slovak Parties. Before passing to the minorities parties, it is necessary to refer to the Slovak parties. All the Czechoslovak parties extended their activities both to Slovakia and to the Carpathian region (now part of Russia), but only the Agrarian Party had firm roots there, owing to the fact that it amalgamated with the Slovak National and Farmers' Party, and was thereby enabled to secure almost a quarter of a million votes. The other non-socialist parties gained only a few tens of thousands of votes in Slovakia, and were therefore of small political importance there. The only other party of importance there, in addition to

c Founded in 1896 with a Socialist program but which rejected Marxism. Membership consisted largely of the upper working classes, office employees and some professional people. It had a strong women's section. Dr. Beneš belonged to this group.

d Founded in 1918, it represented largely the interests of industry, financial circles, property owners; its leader, Dr. Kramar was Prime Minister during the Constitutional Assembly. The party combined with the National Union before the 1935 elections.

e Founded in 1922, the leader was Msgr. Sramek, who became Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile in London in World War II. The Catholic clerical parties were the only ones unable to unite Czech and Slovak wings in one party.

f Founded in 1918. It was always the strongest party in Slovakia; it included 2 Deputies of the Ruthenian party, one of the united Polish parties, and one of the Slovak Protestant Party.

g Split off from the Social Democratic Party in 1921, but lost votes heavily.

h The party of German Nationalists with a Nazi form of organization and propaganda. Founded and led by Konrad Henlein; it secured 58 per cent of the German-speaking votes in 1935.

i Represented together about 60 per cent of the Hungarian vote, the remainder being scattered among the Agrarian, Social Democratic and Communist parties.

the Agrarian Party and the Socialist parties, was the Slovak People's Party, which placed emphasis on the autonomist part of its program.

It ought to be emphasized that none of the Slovak leaders—with the exception of Dr. Bela Tuka, who turned up as Hitler's "quisling" eventually—wished to secede from the Republic before March, 1939. But Hlinka's party, to which Tuka belonged, was the one which became the totalitarian party of "liberated" Slovakia in 1939, and hence we must note the issues involved.

Shortly after the foundation of the Republic, there was a large exodus of the Czechs from the Roman Catholic Church, since Catholicism was associated with the hated Austrian regime. This anti-clericalism soon subsided and complete religious toleration was granted by the Constitution. But this religious issue was in part responsible for difficulties which arose between the Czechs and Slovaks. Slovakia's anti-Czech Catholic priests did not fail to attack the Czechoslovak Government for its supposedly "anti-religious" policies. This attitude was also fomented by the Hungarian priests. At first the Slovak Clerical (Autonomous) Party, under Father Hlinka, and the Czech Clericals under Msgr. Sramek (later the Prime Minister of the Government-in-exile in London) cooperated, but after a while this link with the Czechs was severed. The opposition of Hlinka was partly personal. A Roman Catholic priest, he exercised great influence over the quick and sensitive Slovaks. A brave and devoted Slovak patriot in prewar Hungary, he carried his early fighting spirit into the Czechoslovak State and preferred "Slovak" to "Czechoslovak" patriotism. When he died in August, 1938, his place as leader of the Slovak Autonomist Party was taken by Tiso, also a priest and a former Minister of Health. (Subsequently Tiso also became a "quisling" of Hitler.)

Hlinka's opposition took the form of a strong demand for Slovak autonomy or self-government for the Slovaks—a demand which was enthusiastically received by Henlein and by Germany and Poland and Hungary which saw in it a means of disrupting the Czechoslovak state. But it must also be noted that Hlinka's party had a bare majority of the Slovak votes; the rest were cast for Czechoslovak parties (chiefly Agrarians and Social Democrats) and these Slovak voters were represented in the government. Dr.

Milan Hodza, the Agrarian Prime Minister, and Dr. Dérer, the Social Democratic Minister of Justice, were both Slovaks.⁸

Politics of Minorities. Among the national minorities the most complete classification was found among the Germans, who had their Agrarian Party, their National Party, their Christian Socialist Party, their National Socialists, their Social Democrats and their Communists. These and other minorities' parties are shown on the following table; the last two columns give the proportions of the last prewar House belonging to each nationality and the proportion of the general population:⁹

Note, however, that all the deputies of minor nationalities sat in Parliament for their separate national parties; some represented the larger general parties: Social Democratic or Communist. The table indicates that Germans and Poles were slightly better represented in the lower house than their proportion of the total population would warrant. Not all deputies of minor nationalities sat for their separate national parties. Some represented the larger general parties: Social Democratic or Communist.

This same careful plan of proportional representation applied to provincial, district and town administrations. In the Provincial Board of Bohemia, there were 83 Czechs and 37 Germans; in that of Moravia and Silesia, 44 Czechs, 14 Germans, and 1 Pole;

⁸ Hlinka based his demand for autonomy on the famous Pittsburgh Agreement. The Convention, signed by Masaryk and representatives of the Slovak League and other societies in America, expressed itself in favor of Czechoslovak unity but also for a considerable degree of autonomy for Slovakia. But none of the signatories had any mandate to sign such an agreement, and, with the exception of Masaryk, nearly all the signers were American citizens. In fact, the final clause made the whole agreement contingent upon its endorsement by constitutionally elected representatives of both Czechs and Slovaks at home after the war. See: Ivan Dérer, *The Unity of the Czechs and Slovaks. Has the Pittsburgh Declaration Been Carried Out?* (Prague: Orbis, 1938).

⁹ Based on Brackett Lewis, *Democracy in Czechoslovakia* (New York: American Friends of Czechoslovakia, 1941), p. 17.

	1920	1925	1929	1929	Proportion of Deputies %	Population %
Czechoslovaks	199	207	208	206	68.66	66.9
Germans	73	75	73	72	24.00	22.3
Hungarians	9	10	8	10	3.33	4.8
Ruthenians		6	6	8	2.67	3.8
Poles		2	3	2	0.67	0.6
Jews			2	2	0.67	1.3
	281	300	300	300	100.00	99.7

in Slovakia, 49 Slovaks and 5 Hungarians; in Ruthenia, 16 Ruthenes and 2 Hungarians. In 46 districts and 3363 towns Germans were in the majority in the governing council and the Czechs and Slovaks had only a minor voice in local public affairs. As a matter of fact, complaints by Czech minorities in German-speaking communities about their treatment in the use of school or relief funds were as loud as those of German minorities elsewhere. The Germans had two and then three Ministers in the national Cabinet from the time when they first consented to enter the Government in 1926 until 1938 when they withdrew during Henlein's revolt.

Henlein's Fifth Column. The surprise of the 1935 elections was the appearance of Henlein's Sudeten German (Nazi) Party with the backing of more than half of the German-speaking voters. It did not, however, succeed in uniting all the German voters, being opposed by the German Social Democratic, Christian Socialist, and Agrarian groups, which had their three ministers in the Cabinet until they withdrew in 1938 after the German occupation of Austria.

From one point of view, the history of the lands of the Bohemian Crown is the history of the struggle between the Czechs and the Germans. These two nationalities did not always quarrel. The Czechs were always ready to cooperate with the Germans so long as the German influence did not threaten to dominate. But any possibility of a threat to Czech independence always brought a vigorous and immediate reaction. This explains the Hussite movement of the 14th century; and this explains the lack of enthusiasm of the Czechs for Henlein in 1938. Between 1620, when the Czechs lost their independence to the Habsburgs, and 1918, the German element became dominant at the expense of the Czechs, reducing them, in their own land, to a nation of servants and doorkeepers.

In 1918 the position was simply reversed. The Czechs won the upper hand, and the Germans resented the process of history which reduced them from the position of dominance to that of a minority. Since Hitlerism offered them a possibility of regaining their dominant status, Nazism appealed to many "Sudeten" Germans—although it must be noted that all the Germans in Czechoslovakia were not followers of Henlein.

In view of the fact Czechoslovakia needed its natural frontiers for reasons of international safety, and since the Germans had

for centuries lived in the so-called "Sudeten" regions¹⁰ alongside the Czechs—not only in close proximity, but actually intermingled—the German-speaking population was left in that country when Czechoslovakia was formed in 1918. A special provision was made in the peace treaties whereby international protection was extended not only to this particular minority but to all other minorities in other states in Eastern Europe—with the noteworthy exception of Great Powers, which were supposed to be advanced enough to dispense with this provision. Czechoslovakia welcomed such an arrangement, for it had no intention of suppressing its own citizens of German descent. It conscientiously observed those minority safeguards, both in letter and in spirit. Henlein was allowed to make speeches against Czechoslovakia both at home and abroad which elsewhere, and particularly in Germany, would have been considered treason. The Germans, forming 22 per cent of the population, had 23 per cent of the seats in the Czechoslovak Parliament. They were brought up in their German language schools supported by the Czechoslovak Government. The so-called oppression of the Germans in prewar Czechoslovakia was a myth created by German propaganda.

Another grievance of the Germans was their economic situation. The German districts, being predominantly industrial, had suffered from the economic crisis of the 1930's in Europe and particularly from the restrictive economic policies of Germany. After Germany established her autarchic trade system, Czechoslovakia, and especially manufacturers among the German minority, who had sent 37 per cent of their exports to Germany, found to their regret that their trade with the Reich was reduced to about 10 per cent. Then the Germans had subscribed heavily during World War I to the Austrian war loans, which were honored to 75 per cent by the Czech state. Many Germans speculated in German marks also, and lost heavily in the 1923 German inflation.

It is true that in the areas where there was more than 50 per cent of German population, prewar unemployment was more prevalent than in the purely Czech areas—relatively 2.2 times as much as in the other areas of the Republic. Yet this was not specifically a Czechoslovak feature, but one that occurred

¹⁰ The concept of the "Sudetenland" as a geographical unit was invented by German propaganda before Munich. Actually the term refers to only one of the mountain ridges on the borders of the province of Bohemia.

throughout the world. In all countries without exception industrial areas passed through a graver crisis and had more unemployed persons than had agricultural areas. The districts in Czechoslovakia with a predominantly German population were strongly industrial, while the agricultural districts had a Czech or Slovak majority. Textile, glass, porcelain, and coal industries had a bad time in all countries, and so also in Czechoslovakia. But it was impossible to convince the Germans that the great bulk of the Czechs, who inhabited the frontier regions in common with the German element and consisting of textile-workers, glass-makers, and miners, were passing through a crisis equally grave as that with which their German neighbors were faced. Moreover, some German employers in Czechoslovakia wanted to join Hitler's Reich, hoping that Hitler would destroy all labor organizations.

Another complaint of the Germans was that they were not sufficiently represented in certain government offices. It is true that Czechoslovak government authorities did not have too much enthusiasm for appointing to the state service the elements which in many cases had been openly anti-Czech and pro-Nazi.

ADMINISTRATION

Local Government. The basic local self-government unit was the commune, a council, the committees (particularly the financial committee) and the communal board of magistrates. In Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia further factors in the communal administration were the notaries—state officials. Their duty was to see to the state administration of the communes and the latter had to carry out their arrangements. In the internal affairs of the Slovak and Carpatho-Ruthenian communes, the decisions were made by the communal organs (the mayor, the communal council and assembly) with the cooperation of the notary who had the right to oppose and annul communal resolutions. A higher unit of local self-government is the district, governed by elected organs—the district assembly and a district committee. They were concerned with their own financial affairs, game laws, agricultural sanitation, social and culture affairs, communications and workhouses. Their decisions were carried out by the state administrative authorities. The highest areas of local government

were the lands, administered by the territorial committees nominated by the Government on the basis of proportional representation. They dealt with the affairs of the communes and districts, financial institutions like the Land Bank and the Mortgage Bank, the territorial forced-labor and reformatory institutions, cultural institutions (theatres, museums, galleries), the corn exchange, the agricultural and handicraft schools, the lower elementary and higher elementary schools, and land improvement. Slovakia was administered through county areas, headed by the "zupan" (state official) and a district committee of eight elected members. The state administration and the self-government administration authorities were combined in these county and district offices. A similar system prevailed in Carpathian Ruthenia.

Courts. Czechoslovakia also had the Constitutional Court (which, however, never declared any law unconstitutional); the Supreme Court of Administration, which decided as to the legality of the decisions and measures of the administration authorities; the Electoral Court; the Supreme Court of Justice, the highest court for civil cases and a court of appeal in criminal cases; and the State Court, which dealt with crimes against the State. The ordinary civil courts comprised the district courts of first instance, the courts of second instance and the Supreme Court. The ordinary criminal courts comprised the district courts, the courts of first instance, the jury courts, the grand jury courts, the courts of second instance, the Supreme Court and the State Court. In addition to these ordinary courts there were extraordinary and arbitration courts—trade courts, the patents courts, and the supreme income-tax court, mining dispute and social insurance courts. Judges were appointed for life.

THE MUNICH INTERLUDE

The Munich surrender of Sept. 29, 1938, and the Vienna award of Nov. 2, 1938, hacked from Czechoslovakia 19,000 square miles of territory and 4,992,400 inhabitants. Since the presence of President Beneš was considered a source of irritation to Hitler, the Czech leader resigned his post October 5 under German pressure and on the 22nd flew to London. The day before, a new Cabinet was formed under General Syrový, with Dr. Frantisek Chalovsky, a Germanophile Agrarian leader, as Minister of Foreign

Affairs. On Nov. 30, 1938, the Czech Parliament elected Dr. Emil Hacha to succeed Beneš. Thereafter Hitler exercised great influence over the course of events. By December the Parliament was controlled by a German-sponsored National Unity Party which had absorbed all other parties except the Communist Party which was abolished.

Slovak Problem. A little more than a week after Munich, Hlinka's Slovaks demanded autonomy. Czechoslovakia was re-constituted as a federal union of Czechs, Slovaks, and Carpatho-Ruthenians (Ukrainians), with central departments of national defense, foreign affairs and finance. In addition to legislative bodies for the provinces of Bohemia-Moravia, Slovakia, and Carpathian Ukraine, there was to be a joint legislature, but it never materialized. The Slovak Diet (limited to the Slovak People's Party) of 63 members was elected on Dec. 18, 1938, under Premier Tiso. A similar Fascist pattern appeared in Carpathian Ruthenia, where only the People's Party was allowed to exist.

But all this did not help what was left of Czechoslovakia. The Nazis endeavored to create the impression that Czechoslovakia was collapsing from within and that they were needed to protect the victims of Czech "brutalities" and of "plundering Hussite mobs." On March 12, 1939, the Prague government decided to intervene in Bratislava against the Slovak extremists by deposing Tiso. Then the Nazis intervened. Tiso was summoned to Berlin and confronted with an ultimatum asking him to proclaim the independence of Slovakia; the Slovak Parliament refused on March 14, but when the Nazis threatened invasion, it capitulated and proclaimed the independence of the country.

The creation of a separate Slovak state separated the Ruthenians from the Czechs, and the provincial government at Chust had to proclaim its independence. This lasted only 24 hours, for Hungarian troops invaded and occupied the territory.

Hacha's Surrender. Hacha was "invited" to Berlin on Mar. 14, 1939, and terrorized into placing "the destiny of the Czech people and lands trustfully in the hands of the Fuehrer . . . in the interests of pacification." But German troops had occupied two Czech cities even before Hacha's arrival in Berlin. On March 15 the transformation of Bohemia and Moravia into a German Protectorate was announced.

Protectorate. The fiction of the independence of the Protectorate of Bohemia-Moravia and of Slovakia was kept up for a

while. Hitler signed a treaty with Tiso at Vienna on Mar. 18, 1939, legalizing German occupation of Slovakia. A special political status was reserved for the small German minority of about 100,000 and a German Under-Secretary of State was appointed. The Czech President was allowed his own Cabinet, appointed with the Nazi Protector's "approval." The Protector's office, a vast and complex apparatus with 15 divisions, became, in fact, the exclusive source of legislative and administrative power of the Protectorate. A policy of de-nationalization, expropriation, and terrorization was inaugurated by Hitler's representatives; with a parallel increasing resistance of the Czechs, in spite of the growing numbers of executions and repressive measures. The destruction of Lidice, with its subsequent world-wide horror and resentment, was one of the results.

THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Much of the spirit of resistance was the outgrowth of the news coming from abroad, describing how Dr. Beneš was able to bring his country into the Allied camp. After lecturing at the University of Chicago, he gave up this position in order to head a Czechoslovak government-in-exile in London, which was eventually recognized by the Allied governments as the *de facto* government of the country. He formed a government of all parties, except the Communists, with Jan Masaryk and Hubert Ripka as his mainstays and with Gen. Sergěj Ingr as Secretary of War. Stefan Osuský became Minister of State without any influence, and later on resigned and went to Brazil and the United States. When Germany's war with the Soviet Union started on June 22, 1941, the Communists entered the State Council, an advisory body to the government-in-exile.

At the same time a Czechoslovak National Council was formed in Moscow which consisted of Col. Zdenek Fierlinger (who later became the first Prime Minister of liberated Czechoslovakia), and Klement Gottwald (Czech Communist leader who was to succeed Fierlinger as Prime Minister in 1946), together with Slanský, who eventually became General Secretary of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia, and Colonel Pika, Military Attaché in Moscow. The main opposition against the Communist influence came from army circles in the west; the main supporter of close co-

operation with the Communists within the provisional government was Ripka.

Apart from minor criticism, the Moscow National Council did not try to impose its will on the London Government of Beneš. In October, 1944, however, it insisted on the inclusion of General Svoboda as Minister of National Defense.

The victories of the Red Armies were a certification of the growing influence of Soviet Russia in central-eastern Europe. Beneš left London for Moscow in March, 1945. After four days of negotiation with leaders of the National Council, under active Russian influence, a new government was formed in which the Interior, National Defense, Education, Information, and Agriculture portfolios went to Communists. This Government announced its program in the declaration of Košice, in April, 1945. The main points of the declaration were: Czechoslovakia was to be a national state of Czechs, Slovaks and Sub-Carpathian Ukrainians; enemy minorities were to be expelled; industries were to be nationalized; national administration in each section was to be entrusted to the local government; and the new popular democracy was to be based on a four-party National Front to which no other parties were to be admitted. A few weeks later, the Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia (Ukraine) was ceded to the Soviet by the alleged wish of the population.

On May 5, 1945, the population of Prague started an armed uprising against the Germans. On the same day, the 22nd Corps of the United States 3rd Army stormed Plzeň about 65 miles from Prague. The next day the armored spearhead of the 3rd Army took Beroun, 15 miles from Prague, and nine American tanks entered the western suburbs of Prague, but at the request of the Red Army the advancing United States forces stopped and withdrew to Rokicany (about 58 miles from Prague). On May 9, Prague was entered by armored units of Marshal Koniev's Red Army.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA UNDER BENEŠ

With the liberation of Czechoslovakia, the country emerged with four political parties in Bohemia-Moravia, and four political parties in Slovakia, a region with an undefined but very large measure of autonomy. The parties of Bohemia-Moravia were those listed on the next two pages.

The Communist Party, whose avowed program was close collaboration with the Soviet Union, far-reaching nationalization, expropriation, and expulsion of the national minorities; a strong line against "reaction"; close cooperation of all Slavonic states; "anti-Fascist" political education in the schools; strong distrust of the western democracies; the integration of the Czech economy into the Soviet economy and a two-year plan. The Communists had led the resistance movement in Czechoslovakia after Munich, and they were untainted by the Munich agreement. Holding key offices in the government with control over other key posts, and standing as the most uncompromising advocates of nationalization, they soon became the strongest party in Czechoslovakia.

The Social Democratic Party under the leadership of Fierlinger differed very little, if at all, in its general line from the Communists. Opposition within the party to its pro-Communist line was weak and inarticulate.

The National Socialist Party, structurally and ideologically similar to the French Radical Socialist Party, represented a large section of the middle classes and was, or was supposed to be, the mouthpiece of Dr. Beneš. Its declared program was social reform at a moderate pace, and it objected to the volume and speed of nationalization. Chauvinistic, it favored the expulsion of all minorities, and attacked the Communists and Social Democrats for not being ruthlessly effective in this respect. On the other hand, it was genuinely opposed to totalitarianism, favored cooperation with the western democracies and became the rallying point for some of the finest intellectuals of the country trying to uphold the democratic traditions of Masaryk. It absorbed the rank and file of the outlawed Agrarian Party.

The People's Party, the old Catholic Party, aspired to become the conservative party. It was the only Czech political organization which pleaded for a more lenient treatment of the Sudeten Germans and tried to criticize nationalization in principle. Monsignor Sramek, its leader, who became Deputy Prime Minister, favored close cooperation with the west.

Slovakia. In Slovakia, the *Democratic Party*, which organized the former Agrarians and the members of the Slovak People's Party, was strongly anti-socialist, nationalist, and against any Czech influence in Slovak life. Avowedly pro-Western and anti-Russian, it was favored by 60 per cent of the Slovak electorate.

The Slovak Communist Party, the product of the fusion of

Communists and Socialists, differed little from the Czech Communist Party, and was, roughly speaking, favored by 35 per cent of the electorate.

The Slovak Labor Party, founded in November, 1945, after some moderate Socialists had left the Communist Party, was a reformist Socialist Party; 3 per cent of the Slovak electorate were behind it; in June, 1946, the party entered the Czech Social Democratic Party.

The Slovak Freedom Party was founded in March, 1946. Slovak Catholic conservatives resented the strong Protestant influence in the Democratic Party and wanted to win over the electorate on a Catholic conservative program. The Democratic Party countered this potential danger by co-opting influential Catholics into its Central Committee. Thus the Freedom Party was only able to win 2 per cent of the Slovak electorate. The success of the Party was somewhat hampered by a pastoral letter of the Slovak Episcopate forbidding priests to take an active part in Slovak political life or stand as candidates.

Supporting Organizations. The political organization is supported by the Association of Czech Youth, allegedly an all-party organization, whose leadership is in the hands of the Communists and whose educational activities—the main task of this organization—conform strictly to the doctrine of historical materialism in its Russian interpretation. The Association of Slovak Youth became the Slovak counterpart of this Czech organization.

The trade unions became structurally similar to the American C.I.O. The base of the union is the factory organization; the factory organization of a district forms a district union and the district unions are directed by the Central Union Council. Although all four political parties were represented in the Central Council, the real power was in the hands of the Communist Chairman, Zapotocký, and the Social Democratic General Secretary, Erban. The Unified Trade Union became, in fact, a state within the state. After the liberation the members formed factory councils which took over production, sacked the managers and formed factory militia. This state of affairs was, however, soon ended and managers became responsible to the Ministry of Industry. Nevertheless, the power of the Union is considerable. The Presidential decree of October 24, 1945, created factory committees, and the Trade Union is the only organization having the right to propose candidates. The factory committees are entitled

to use 10 per cent of the net profits of nationalized enterprises for the education and leisure of the employees. The Central Union Council recommended that it should be employed for factory clubs and political libraries.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

According to the Košice program, there was to be freedom of speech and of the press. But this freedom became limited by four axiomatic rules which nobody was allowed to break without being considered a traitor: (1) Nobody was allowed to criticize or undermine the unity of the four parties which formed the National Front and supported the program of Košice; (2) Nobody was allowed to criticize the alliance with the Soviet Union; (3) Nobody was allowed to criticize nationalization as such, though the extent could be questioned; and (4) Nobody was allowed to criticize the transfer of the Germans.

Within these limits, the press was free and uncensored. But no private individual was allowed to publish a daily paper or periodical; this right was reserved to political parties and organizations of national importance. Paper and newspaper print was allocated by the Ministry of Information. The Czechoslovak Press Bureau, which distributed foreign news and supervised broadcasting, also came under this Ministry. At the same time, the Ministry of Education was in the hands of the Czech Communist, Professor Nejedlý, who introduced the new subject of political education "in an anti-Fascist sense" and made Russian a compulsory subject in all schools.

The foundation of the Czechoslovak Government, according to the Košice program, was the local national committees. They replaced all former bodies of local self-government, and were composed of an equal number of representatives of the four parties of the National Front, the trade unions, etc. Committee members were elected by acclamation. The local national committees elected the district national committees; the district national committees elected the national committees of Bohemia, Moravia and Slovakia. For example, the Slovak district national committees elected the Slovak National Council, which in turn elected the officials of the Slovak Government.

The power of the local and higher national committees was

far-reaching, for they distributed German confiscated property, allotted flats and houses, and had power to order detentions without judicial warrant, issue ration cards, and strike the names of persons whom they adjudged nationally unreliable off the electoral register. The police were at their disposal. Representatives of the National Committees on October 21, 1945, elected the Provisional National Assembly which was dissolved after the election of the Constituent Assembly on May 26, 1946.

The local police forces were amalgamated and a new unified police, the Guard for National Security (*S.N.B.*) was created. It consisted of ordinary police (*C.I.D.*), national security (political) police and two regiments for special use. In an administrative sense, the police came under the Minister of Interior, Vaclav Nosek, who was a Communist.

ELECTIONS OF 1946

On May 26, 1946, Czechoslovakia elected a Constitutional Assembly in the first election since its liberation. The results were as follows:

<i>Party</i>	<i>Number of Deputies</i>
Czech Communists.....	93
Czech Socialists.....	55
Czech People's (Catholic).....	46
Slovak Democrats.....	43
Czech Social Democrats.....	37
Slovak Communists.....	21
Slovak Freedom Party.....	3
Slovak Labor.....	2

The President of the Republic, Dr. Beneš, was re-elected at the second meeting of the Assembly, on June 19, 1946. He then called on the Communist leader, Klement Gottwald, as head of the largest single party, to form a new government.

The memory of Munich obviously played an important part in the election, and thereafter continued to shape the political history of the little country which after 1918 had brought democracy to central Europe. The Czechs remembered that Russia, alone, had offered help against Hitler in 1938. They remembered that France and Britain had sold their country down the river. And many of them voted Communist.

Gottwald. Gottwald was regarded by his supporters as the Czech counterpart of Josef Stalin. Like the Russian leader, he

exhibited a calm, unruffled disposition and his manner of speech was deliberate and direct; he had no mustache, but otherwise he bore some physical resemblance to Stalin.

Gottwald drew on his own experiences as a farm boy and wood-working apprentice in championing the workers. The son of a peasant family born at Dědice, Moravia, Nov. 23, 1896, he worked on a farm, and was apprenticed at the age of twelve to a village cabinet-maker. At sixteen he joined labor organizations and the Social Democratic Youth movement. With the outbreak of World War I, the Austrians took him into an artillery regiment, and he was wounded on the eastern front. Then he fought on the Piave front in Italy. He came out of war troubled that workers of one nation were fighting those of another; and the Russian revolution of October, 1917, impressed him as pointing the way to possible unity of the working classes. In 1917 he became a leader of the Left Wing of the Social Democratic Party, and in 1921 he became prominent in the Czechoslovak Communist movement and was elected to the Czechoslovak Parliament. A Czech battery defending Madrid was named in his honor during the Spanish civil war. After Munich, he and other Communist leaders fled to Moscow. After Russia entered World War II, he broadcast anti-German propaganda from Moscow, helped to organize underground activity against the Nazis, and translated a number of Russian works into Czech. One of the authors of the Košice program, he undertook as Prime Minister to supervise the trial marriage between communism and democracy in Czechoslovakia.

EXPERIMENT IN A MERGER BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM

Under Gottwald the Communists obtained five key posts in the Cabinet. Within one year after Czechoslovakia's liberation from Nazi rule the following steps were taken: Nationalization put under tight state ownership and control the entire banking and credit system, all private insurance, all utilities, and 75 per cent of all industry. Confiscation by decree abolished the wealthy as a class and permanently expropriated the property of some three million German and Hungarian inhabitants of the republic. Large estates held by Germans and Hungarians, or other Nazi

collaborators, were divided into small farms and opened up to individual ownership by loyal farmer-citizens. Compulsory labor was made universal. Taxes on individuals went up to three times the prewar rate.

All this had taken place in democratic Czechoslovakia under a coalition government in which all the four major parties were considerably left of center—by United States standards. Although non-Communist Jan Masaryk continued in the important post of Minister of Foreign Affairs, the real power in the Ministry was Vlado Clementis, a Communist, as an Under-Secretary. Head of the national police, as Minister of Interior, was Vaclav Nosek, Czech Communist, who had trained with Russia's celebrated secret police, the NKVD; under him, the strength of the police increased from a prewar 35,000 to 50,000.

On the other hand, Czechoslovakia's Communists at the end of 1946 had not used their power to insist on complete socialization. Nationalization had been halted at 75 per cent of industrial capacity and small manufacturers and merchants remained free to pursue private enterprise. Agriculture continued in the hands of individuals; farms were not collectivized. Labor unions remained independent of the Government (though largely in the hands of the Communists). The freedom of religion still seemed to be secure.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Alongside these internal problems, stands the major external problem, that of relations with Russia. The new map of Central Europe reveals the basic considerations dictating Czech foreign policy. To the east Czechoslovakia has now for the first time a common frontier with Russia. To the north lies Russian-dominated Poland and the Russian zone of Germany; to the west, the Russian zone of Austria; to the south, Russian-dominated Hungary and Romania. In these circumstances, a Czech policy of intimate friendship with Russia is not surprising, although Beneš is trying to promote cooperation between Russia and the Western Powers. He believes that the Russians "will continue to develop toward greater and greater individual freedom," and that the Western Powers will move toward socialism in economics. He feels that East and West will grow more alike and closer together.

RED PATTERN USED IN PRAGUE

Since the end of World War II, the only hope for Czech democrats seemed to be cooperation in internal affairs with the Communists and in foreign affairs with the U.S.S.R. But in February, 1948, it appeared that this amount of compliance did not satisfy the Kremlin. Having crushed all opposition in the rest of central-eastern Europe behind the "Iron Curtain," and having organized that area into a solid bloc of Communist-dominated satellites, Soviet Russia embarked on a drive to bring under its iron heel the last nation within that bloc which had still shown some signs of independence. Although within the Soviet sphere (together with Finland, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and Albania), Czechoslovakia (together with Finland) was the only country where rigid Communist control had not been inaugurated and the country which had managed to retain a considerable degree of independence. To be sure, Czechoslovakia had almost always voted with the U.S.S.R. in the United Nations; and Prague had been prevailed upon by Moscow to decline participation in the Marshall Plan, contrary to its expressed preference.

There was a grim familiarity about events in Czechoslovakia in February, 1948, when the Communists began bearing down (after the experimental "putsch" in the fall of 1947 had bogged down). The drive was headed, nominally, by Klement Gottwald, the Communist Premier. But behind him stood Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin, who had arrived in Prague at this critical time (as other Kremlin Commissars had arrived at similar junctures in other countries—as the former King Mihai, for instance, could testify about Vishinsky—about to be taken over by the Communist International, of which the Czechoslovak Communist Party is a charter member). And the drive was organized along the same lines that had proved so successful in Poland and the Balkans, if not in the West. The cabinet crisis had been precipitated by the extension of Communist control over the police, the bone of contention that had set so many Popular Front Ministers at one another's throats since World War II. The Communist Prime Minister appealed in Prague for labor union support against his non-Communist colleagues, calling them (the epithets might have been lifted from Communist speeches in Poland, Hungary, Romania, France, Italy) "reactionaries," "tools of for-

eign imperialists," "authors of a new Munich." Labor responded with the promise of a demonstration strike. There was the same attempt to repress free speech, the same mobilization of Communist-dominated labor unions, the same effort to oust all independent parties from the Government, and the same demand for a new National Front whose Communist character was but thinly camouflaged by Pan-Slavism.¹¹ Above all, and most ominously, there was raised the same Communist hue and cry against alleged plots, espionage, and sabotage on the part of the "reactionary" majority and American and British "imperialists," which initiated the elimination of the Petkovs and the Manius and served to liquidate all opposition in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, and Hungary.

Stalin Turns the Screws. On July 1, 1947, the Czechoslovak government decided to cooperate in the Marshall Plan. But Gottwald was "invited" to Moscow, and on July 10, after a telephone message from him from Moscow to Prague, the Prague cabinet decided not to participate in the Paris Conference to discuss the plan. Two days later, Gottwald and Foreign Minister Masaryk returned from Moscow with the project of a five-year Czechoslovak-Soviet trade agreement (signed in final form on December 11, 1947), which provided for an increase of Czechoslovak foreign trade with the U.S.S.R. to 16 per cent of the total (as compared with 5 per cent in 1938). But there was a continued growth of unrest, especially among the anti-Soviet circles in the country. Quisling Tiso's hanging on April 18, 1947, evoked violent criticism in Catholic Slovak circles; this, in turn, was the pretext of Communist demands that the Slovak Democrats get rid of their "fascist" elements. On September 15, Prague announced the arrest of eighty persons as ring-leaders in a plot to overthrow the Republic and kill Beneš, Masaryk, and other leaders. During the same month, the crypto-Communist leader of the Social Democratic Party, chained to the Communist chariot, overplayed his hand against the democratic workers, already exasperated by two years of Communist terror in the factories; secretly he met Gottwald, and in the name of the two parties, but without authority, signed an "agreement" to adopt an

¹¹ For the formula used to transfer power from coalition governments to Communist cliques, see: *Behind "The Iron Curtain"* (reprinted from the New York *Herald Tribune*, 1947, 10¢), a valuable series of studies prepared by four correspondents, Russell Hill, Walter Kerr, Ned Russell, and William Attwood.

identical line on all political questions with the Communists. On October 12, the Slovak Social Democrats fused with their Czech comrades for mutual defense against Communist intrigue; a week later the newly-fused movement issued a sharp denunciation of the Cominform and rejected the appeal to oppose Social Democrats in Western countries. The Party Congress met in November and by an enormous majority, ousted Fierlinger from his leadership, replacing him by that vigorous protagonist of independence, Bohumil Laušman.

The step was a brave beginning of resistance; so, too, was the stand of the majority Slovak Democratic Party against the attempts of the Communist minority to overthrow them by a *coup d'état* in October.

To rally round the standard of the Western concepts of democracy when the Communists control the Ministry of the Interior was to court disaster—as the events of February, 1948, were to show. At any rate, for the moment all went well. Just after the ousting of Fierlinger, there were elections in the Commercial Faculty of Prague University; in 1947, the Communists secured 280 votes to the Socialists' 100; as a result of Fierlinger's incident, the Socialists shot ahead with 259 votes to the Communists' 253.

It was over honest elections that the trial of strength was to come. The discovering of "plots" had started. Then came February, 1948.

The February, 1948, Formula. The success of the Communist drive depended on Communist ability in winning over or eliminating two elements that stood in their way. One was President Beneš, who still carried the greatest personal authority in the country, and who not only refused to accept the protest resignation of twelve Ministers from the Cabinet but also served notice that he would continue to insist on a parliamentary régime and would not accept any Cabinet that would exclude one group or the other from the Government. The other was the Social Democratic Party which had declared its solidarity with the majority, but whose Ministers had not resigned. This party, together with the Communists, could muster a slight majority in Parliament that would undermine President Beneš' stand. But the Social Democrats refused to serve with the Communists alone.

In favor of the strength of Gottwald's Communists were several factors. They had already neutralized the Army through infiltration; they controlled the important labor unions; they domi-

nated the official radio system from which all other parties were barred; they ran the larger part of the nationalized industry; and though their effort to get complete control of the police brought a Cabinet revolt, it was a question whether that revolt did not come too late.

The Communists, therefore, were ready for the final *coup*. Czechoslovakia was to hold a new national election in the spring of 1948. And though the Communists won 38 per cent of the vote in the last election (1946), they were apparently determined not to take any chances without having complete control of the government and the election machinery. In line of this reasoning, Gottwald pressed Beneš by disclosing far-reaching economic demands and scheduling a one-hour demonstrative general strike. The economic demands would completely sweep away the postwar compromise in the nation's economy and would carry the country far along the road to complete destruction of remaining private enterprise; included was a demand amounting to the overthrow of freedom of the press through state ownership of all publishing establishments, including those of political parties.

President Beneš negotiated with party leaders to solve the Cabinet crisis by constitutional and peaceful means, while refusing to accept the resignation of the non-Communist members. Then the Moscow-directed Communist minority resorted to an open show of armed force. The Communist Ministry of the Interior threw heavily armed Communist-dominated police around all government buildings and foreign embassies, seized the headquarters of the National Socialist Party, to which President Beneš belonged, closed all borders and began to arrest members of anti-Communist parties. (One of the first to be arrested was a member of the Ministry of Justice who had traced a bomb plot against three Ministers in the fall of 1947 to the same Communists who at this time were accusing the other parties of plotting against the state.) As a result the Czechoslovak Cabinet crisis assumed distinctly revolutionary aspects; it served notice that if the Communists could not win supreme power under the cover of legality through acquiescence by the head of state they were ready to seize power by revolution. (In that respect they followed the methods employed by the Communists throughout central-eastern Europe and by the Nazis and Fascists in Germany and Italy.)

This method worked; the left-wing members of the Social Democratic Party started negotiating with the Communists for

Cabinet posts; on February 25, 1948, President Beneš gave Premier Gottwald¹² permission to install a Communist-dominated government of the type found in other central-eastern-Balkan European countries considered satellites of the Soviet Union; 12 Reds, 7 pro-Reds and 2 non-Party Ministers (including Jan Masaryk, Thomas G. Masaryk's son) were appointed. But the Communists had already seized power through the police and army, and through their Action Committees. They continued purging the opposition parties, arrested more than a hundred on charges of "plotting" against their rule, suppressed freedom of press and speech, occupied factories and broken up student counter-demonstrations with rifle fire.

The Eastern Entente. As a result, Czechoslovakia, already tied to the U.S.S.R. and her satellites by military alliances,¹³ became an integral part of the vast totalitarian bloc that stretched from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and from the Oder, or perhaps the Elbe, to the Bering Strait. This meant not only the collapse of the world of Teheran and Yalta, in the same manner that Hitler's seizure of Czechoslovakia meant the collapse of the world of Versailles, but also a further shift in the balance of power in Europe—and thus of the world.

¹² Klement Gottwald's career is similar to those of all the other European Communist leaders who were (1948) Moscow-backed chiefs of governments behind the "iron curtain." Born in a small Moravian town 1896, Gottwald, like Hitler, spent his early youth in Vienna where, as a carpenter, he joined the Socialist movement. He was started on his career by Dmitri Manuilsky, one of the oldest pillars of the Politburo (in 1938 Ukrainian delegate to the United Nations), who came to Prague in 1925 to reorganize the Communist Party. He became Chairman of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. Like all the other European Communist bosses, he spent the years before and during World War II in Moscow. In 1938 he went to the Soviet capital and was coached for his future task. When Beneš went to Moscow in 1945, at the instigation of Stalin he met Gottwald who never concealed his contempt for "the most talkative Czech intellectual." Gottwald forced upon Beneš the original program for the reconstruction of the country.

¹³ Czechoslovakia signed with the U.S.S.R. the twenty-year mutual aid pact on December 12, 1934, supplemented on May 9, 1946, by a Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. Poland concluded a pact of Mutual Aid with the Soviet Union on April 21, 1945; on March 18, 1946, Tito signed a Polish-Yugoslav Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Aid. On March 10, 1947, Gottwald signed a Polish-Czechoslovak Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Aid against aggression by Germany "or any other country which would unite with Germany for this purpose, directly or indirectly." All these treaties, including the Yugoslav-Bulgarian (November 27, 1947) and the Yugoslav-Hungarian Pacts (December 8, 1947), ran for twenty years. An Eastern European Entente under Soviet leadership was completed on February 18, 1948, when Kremlin and Budapest signed a twenty-year Mutual Assistance and Cooperation Pact in Moscow, and Romania signed up with Bulgaria on January 16, 1948.

New Soviet Empire. The seizure of Czechoslovakia rounded up a new Russian Empire which has not only extended dominion over an additional hundred million people and their armies but has also gained a tremendous additional war potential. (It is an ironic sidelight on postwar history that Russia's Czechoslovak prize was put on its feet by nearly a quarter of a billion dollars advanced by the United States.)

Full Story Yet To Be Told. Shocked by the Communist *coup d'état* into their first joint action on Russo-Communist expansion, the governments of the United States, Britain, and France condemned bluntly the establishment of a one-party dictatorship disguised under the cloak of a Government of National Union.¹⁴ Of interest will be the release of the secret documents explaining Soviet-American wartime arrangements for liberating Czechoslovakia—thus adding another chapter to the story of how the Soviets were able to get the upper hand in central-eastern-Balkan Europe from the very end of the war.¹⁵

On March 9, 1948, Jan Masaryk, Foreign Minister in Gottwald's government, plunged to death from his residence in the Foreign Ministry to a paved courtyard sixty feet below; his plunge recalled that Prokop Drtina, Minister of Justice in the previous Cabinet with Masaryk, had taken the same step on February 27. Masaryk's death, whether suicide or murder, shattered the last sorry pretense thrown around the Russo-Communist conquest of Czechoslovakia. In one way or another, Masaryk uttered his protest against the Soviet conquest of his country, reminding his people that their liberties were not betrayed without a silent protest—and that this protest echoed across the world.

¹⁴ In joining with the United States and Britain in their condemnation of the Communist seizure of power in Czechoslovakia, the French Government for the first time formally protested against Soviet methods of domination in central-eastern-Balkan Europe. The French did not follow suit when Washington and London protested against the Communist conquest of Romania or Hungary or against Soviet machinations in Poland.

¹⁵ Involved are such unanswered questions as: Why American troops did not help free Prague in May 1945? Why was the immediate postwar occupation of Czechoslovakia, except for the western tip, handled by the Russians? For the rumblings of this forthcoming controversy, see: E. P. Young, "Letter," *Central European Observer*, XXIV (Sept. 5, 1947), pp. 254-255.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BENEŠ, EDUARD, *My War Memoirs* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1928). A readable account of Beneš techniques and of his political philosophy.
- , *Democracy Today and Tomorrow* (New York: Macmillan, 1939). A review of Beneš' experiment in democratic statesmanship and his hopes for the future of democracy.
- BLOSS, ESTHER, *Labor Legislation in Czechoslovakia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938). A factual description.
- BOROVICKA, J., *Ten Years of Czechoslovak Politics* (Prague: Orbis, 1929). A readable account of Czechoslovakia's postwar politics.
- Czechoslovak Liberation Movement* (London: Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1943). An official, but readable account.
- Czechoslovak Sources and Documents*; No. 1, *Speeches of Jan Masaryk in America*; No. 2, *Struggle for Freedom*; No. 3, *Democracy in Czechoslovakia*; No. 4, *President Beneš on War and Peace* (New York: The Czechoslovak Information Service, 1943).
- DUFF, S. GRANT, *Europe and the Czechs* (New York: Penguin Books, 1938). A valuable survey of the events leading to Munich.
- GEORGE, G. J., *They Betrayed Czechoslovakia* (New York: Penguin Books, 1938). The story of the betrayal by a Czech.
- KERNER, R. J., Ed., *Czechoslovakia: A Record of Two Decades* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1940). The best encyclopaedic introduction to various aspects of Czechoslovakia.
- MASARYK, T. G., *The Making of a State* (New York: Stokes, 1927). Indispensable for an understanding of Masaryk's ideology.
- NOSEK, VLADIMIR, *The Spirit of Bohemia* (New York: Brentano, 1927). A general review of Czech history, literature, and art.
- SETON-WATSON, R. W., Ed., *Slovakia, Then and Now* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1931). A series of pro-Czech articles. Also *A History of the Czechs and Slovaks* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1944). The best available study in English.
- WISKEMANN, ELIZABETH, *Czechs and Germans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938). One of the best introductions to the relation of the German minority to Czechoslovakia.

HUNGARY

Hungary's type of government between 1918 and 1938 was quite puzzling to the average foreign observer. When describing that system, we must guard constantly against what we know in this country as "double talk." Hungary's spokesmen described their system as a "democracy"—and yet by all modern standards it was semi-feudal. Hungary's parliament was "democratic," and yet it was run by great landowners confirmed in their power by a law requiring public ballots in the rural districts; the first completely secret poll in Hungary's history was held only in 1939. Hungary called itself a Kingdom—but no King occupied the throne. When Hungary's former sovereign, the Habsburg King Charles, tried to return to his kingdom in 1921 he was twice prevented from doing so by his "Regent," Admiral Nicholas Horthy, who insisted on wearing his admiral's uniform, although Hungary had no navy and not even a seacoast.

All in all, Hungary was dominated by a small oligarchy of magnates, who occasionally shared their power with the more numerous gentry (or small landowning and official class).

The desire of all Hungarians to regain the "Lost Provinces" induced Budapest to cultivate friendly relations with Mussolini and Hitler, and eventually led Hungary to join the Rome-Berlin Axis. When the territorial gains acquired under Axis auspices were endangered by the course of events in 1944, Horthy tried to extricate his country from the Nazi occupation, only to have it become a battleground for the pro-Nazi and Soviet armies. On January 20, 1945, a new Hungarian provisional government, set up under the Russians in Debrecen, signed an armistice with Moscow, which forced the country to cede all territorial gains since 1937 to Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia, pay large reparations, and declare war against Germany. Thereafter, Hungary, as a defeated state, had to submit to dictation as regards not only her foreign and military policy, but also nearly all important aspects of her domestic policy. The Communists, as the

avored children of the Soviet authorities, exerted their influence. But, in 1945, that experience had engendered in Hungary a fairly widespread revulsion and Hungary's first postwar elections were a plain vote against these excesses. The attempts of the government to accomplish social reforms, long overdue, together with the reparation payments exacted by the Russians, put a terrific strain on Hungary's government. In 1946 and 1947, Hungary represented a type of government transformed suddenly from a semi-feudal character to a semi-dictatorship favoring the masses under the domination of the Communists in key posts, while, paradoxically enough, the popular vote was definitely against Communist domination. Obviously, this type of government and politics was only transitory.

GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Between 1918 and 1938, Hungary was a potato-shaped land, situated just south of Czechoslovakia and about as big as the State of Ohio. To make it, the peace-makers after World War I carved off a peel more than twice as big as what they left. "At first sight Hungary looks like a land of gorgeous musical-comedy costumes and uniforms, from General Ratz down to Prince Festetics' hereditary doorman. But behind all the braid and medals, swords and plumes are a country, a character and a cause that are anything but comic. A fierce fighting people, they are sometimes called the Prussians of the South."¹

Territorial Changes. In both World War I as well as World War II, Hungary's shifts of territory have been spectacular. Before World War I, the country had more than 20,000,000 people and an area of 125,609 square miles. By the Treaty of Trianon, the Allied victors cut Hungary down to roughly a third of its former extent and population, taking away large mineral resources and timberland. In 1939 Hungary formally joined the Axis. In 1941 Hungarian forces invaded Yugoslavia and added their strength to the German invasion of the Soviet Union. In 1938-39, the partition of Czechoslovakia restored to Hungary parts of western Czechoslovakia, of wild, mountainous Ruthenia, and the fertile farm lands of southern Slovakia. By the end of 1940, nearly half

¹ "Hungary, The Kingless Kingdom, Wooed by Germany, Clamors for Lost Land," *Life* (September 12, 1938), pp. 51-61, contains excellent pictures also.

of Transylvania, with its wealth of gold, silver, lead, copper and zinc, and its fields of natural gas, was returned by Romania under Nazi pressure. In all, Hungary regained territory larger than West Virginia, with a population of roughly four and a half million people—including more than a million Romanians.

As the Balkan back door to Germany, Hungary found herself under Russian occupation in 1944. The Carpathian Mountains that rim Hungary's recently acquired Ruthenian district and stretch deep into Romania did not stop the Soviet troops. For west of this mountain barrier, the plains of Hungary spread out into open, flat country, broken only by the north-south course of the Danube and the Tisza. The Danube, cutting through the heart of the country, is a natural corridor leading from the Balkans into Austria, and beyond into the center of what was then Nazi-held Europe. From all directions, railways converge at Budapest, making Hungary a center for communications between Balkan nations and middle Europe.

As Hungary emerged from World War I, except for hills in the north and west, the greater part of the country consisted of one vast plain, where roamed cowboys in picturesque attire—cowboys whose ancestors were there long before America was discovered. Except for the capital, Budapest, the towns of Hungary are relatively unimportant.

Minorities. The defeat of Hungary in World War I and the agony that followed brought no change in the hearts of Hungary's rulers in regard to their minorities. According to the census of 1930, the total population of 8,688,117 was 92.1 per cent Magyar and 5.5 per cent German, the rest being composed of Slovaks, Romanians, Croats and Serbs, and others. But in spite of her signature of the Treaty of Trianon guaranteeing minority rights to racial or national groups, Budapest persisted in her century-old practice of compelling groups within her midst to denationalize themselves. The theory of "a single and indivisible Magyar nation" embodied in a law passed in 1868 has never lost its sway over the minds of the Hungarian rulers. The national minorities had no political representation and no independent political existence. Even the Germans had to content themselves with only 10 per cent of their children attending purely German schools. Religiously, Hungary was divided as follows: 64.9 per cent Roman Catholics, 27 per cent Protestants, 5.1 per cent Jews, and 2.3 per cent Greek Catholics.

Economics. Some 60 per cent of all Hungary is cultivated land. Another 20 per cent is meadow and pasture. This amazingly high percentage of useful land makes Hungary a food reservoir, just what the Nazi Government needed. Hungary normally exports great quantities of cattle, pigs, sheep, horses, geese, pork-fat, wool, feathers, flour, and wheat. The Hungarians avidly try to use every available inch of the land. They worry about flood control, because the wooded headwaters of their rivers belonged to other nations. (The rivers they lost to Romania and Czechoslovakia flow away from those countries' capitals and right back into Hungary). If they strip off the trees, Hungary gets the floods. Since more than half of the Hungarians are farmers, shepherds, cowboys and farm workers, they do their jobs fairly well. Coal and bauxite, the ore from which aluminum comes, have been Hungary's big mineral assets. The production and processing of petroleum in fairly large quantities is a recent development in Hungary.

Social Conditions. Peasant agricultural methods in Hungary are necessarily primitive. A man owning ten acres of land cannot afford modern agricultural machinery; most of the labor is performed by hand, not machines. Prewar Hungary was still a land of big estates, governed in semi-feudal style by their seigneurs, although many thousands of peasants have been settled on small holdings since 1918.² World economics occasioned deep distress in Hungary as in other lands. But the ruling classes blamed everything on the Treaty of Trianon, although peasant discontent could no longer be repressed. Thirty-six Magyar magnates owned a million acres of land; the 1,200,000 peasants who had their own farms owned a total of 950,000 acres. Thirty-six men owned more than 1,200,000 acres. The large landowner paid only 10 pengö in tax per acre; the peasant paid 16 pengö.³ Hungary's non-royal Prince George-Tassilon-Joseph Festetics of Tolna, lord of Keszthely, Saint George, Csurgó, etc., cousin of the British Duke of Hamilton, was one of Hungary's biggest landowners. He

² Hungary used as one of her arguments for return of the "Lost Provinces" the charge that the land reforms of Czechoslovakia and Romania were directed against the Hungarian minorities there. The fact is that Magyar peasants in both countries received allocations of land. It is true that most of the great estates in Transylvania, taken from Hungary, were owned by Magyars or Germans; they were duly expropriated, and very inadequate compensation was paid. But, unfortunately, Romanian landowners were just as unlucky as Magyars or Germans.

³ Bernard Newman, *The New Europe* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), p. 443.

owned nine great farms on both sides of Lake Balaton in western Hungary, worked 500 farm laborers, 600 woodsmen. He paid them in goods, not money. The only bigger landholder was Prince Paul Esterhazy, who owned some 100,000 acres.⁴ A Land Reform Act taxed them one-sixth of their land, divided 430,000 acres among some 400,000 peasants and war veterans (an average of an acre apiece).

Socialism was sternly repressed among the peasants but genuine reforms were carried out under an iron paternalism.⁵

Hungary's over-production of intelligentsia has been an outstanding postwar problem. A solution was sought in the *numerus clausus*, restricting Jewish enrolment in the universities and higher schools to 5 per cent in the early 1920's. The Jews, incidentally, dominated the cultural and commercial life of Hungary until anti-Semitic restrictions were put into effect.

HISTORY

Nobody can understand Hungary today without knowing its history. Into the great mountain basin of the Carpathians more than a thousand years ago rode some 25,000 warrior Magyars. A mysterious, non-Slav people, they came from central Asia, a mixture of a Finnish-Ugrian and an Asiatic-Turkish people. The fertile Danubian basin appealed to them. By the year 900 the conquest was completed. This control was a decisive factor in the shaping of central-eastern Europe—because it drove a wedge between the two main groups of Slavs (Yugoslavs and northern Slavs) and also because it ensured the relative isolation of the Slovaks until quite recent times.

St. Stephen (997-1037), the most prominent figure in Hungarian history, received in the year 1000 from Pope Sylvester II the gift of the Holy Apostolic Crown. The Crown of St. Stephen has ever since remained the symbol of the Hungarian "indivisible" state.

In their social policies the Hungarian conquerors had the conquered aliens (the Slovaks, the Vallachians-Romanians of Tran-

⁴ For documentary pictures, see *Life* (September 12, 1938), pp. 52-53.

⁵ E. D. Beynon, "Migrations of Hungarian Peasants," *The Geographical Review*, XXVII (April, 1937), pp. 214-228, is a good survey of the social system of peasant Hungary.

sylvania and the Ruthenians) work for them. But they gave privileges to German settlers (who constituted a German minority of 800,000 in that part of Transylvania ceded to Romania after World War I). As time went on, the country gradually adopted feudalism. Here was the beginning of the well-known class of Hungary's magnates. The royal power weakened and the landlords oppressed the peasantry.

It is important to note here the background of the dispute over Transylvania, which was acquired by the Hungarians in 1003. They claim that the Romanian element infiltrated and settled there at a later date, while the Romanians contend that, as an integral part of ancient Dacia, Transylvania had been settled by the Romanians before the arrival of the Hungarians—and hence is a Romanian land.

The Hungarians like to compare the Golden Bull, promulgated in 1222, to the Magna Carta, and acclaim it as the origin of Hungarian constitutional liberties and parliamentarianism. It granted the rights of due process of trial, exemption from oppressive taxation, armed resistance against the king for breach of contract, and the like. But these liberties were granted only to the landed gentry: the Golden Bull actually was the guarantee of the power of the nobles over the people.

In 1526 a large Turkish army invaded Hungary. After their defeat at Vienna (1683) the Turks retreated into the Balkans. The Habsburgs occupied all of Hungary. They inaugurated the policy of forceful Catholicization and Germanization. There were continuous rebellions. In particular, the Magyar nobles resented the attempts of Vienna to improve the lot of the peasantry as an encroachment on Magyar nationalistic rights.

The wave of nationalism, reaching Hungary in the 19th century, confronted her with a multi-racial problem. Magyar political nationalism manifested itself in aspirations for independence from Austria. Louis Kossuth's revolution of 1848 was defeated by Emperor Francis Joseph's armies with the aid of the Russian forces. For twenty years thereafter Austria ruled Hungary with despotism until 1867.

In that year, the Habsburg rulers decided to come to terms with their most important minority, and the *Ausgleich* (Compromise) granted the Parliament at Budapest full authority over Hungarian affairs and a share in control of the empire's defense, finance, and foreign affairs. But this gave the Hungarians

a chance to inaugurate a policy of forced assimilation of their non-Magyar minorities. The predominance of the ruling class was assured through a narrow franchise, and still further entrenched by the maintenance of non-secret voting. In 1914, three-fourths of the male population could not vote. The assumption was that Hungary was a Hungarian national state, although the proportion of the inhabitants speaking Magyar barely topped 50 per cent in the census of 1910.

Just before World War I, Hungary was torn apart by racial conflicts, which were complicated by social divisions caused by the Hungarian landlords' exploitation of both the non-Hungarian and Hungarian masses.

Although the Hungarians were against starting World War I, they became involved as a partner in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The Treaty of Trianon deprived Hungary of 75 per cent of her territory and 60 per cent of her population. Slovakia, in the north, went to Czechoslovakia, Transylvania to Romania, Croatia and other areas in the south to Yugoslavia, and Burgenland to Austria. With these territories went considerable Hungarian minorities.

CONSTITUTION OF PREWAR HUNGARY ⁶

Hungary was considered a Monarchy with a vacant throne, the functions of the Monarch being exercised by a Regent. A law passed on July 15, 1937, ended the Regent's responsibility to Parliament.

The Legislature consisted of two houses. The Upper House (by a bill of November 11, 1926) consisted of seven groups: (1) three full-age males of the former reigning dynasty residing permanently in the country; (2) elected representatives of the former hereditary members (about 38); (3) members elected by the town and county municipalities (about 76); (4) heads of the various religious communities, and (5) high dignitaries (judges, the chairman of the National Bank, etc., (about 57); (6) members elected by fixed organizations and institutions and representatives of interests and professions (about 40); and (7) life members

⁶ M. W. Graham, *New Governments of Central Europe* (New York: Henry Holt, 1924), pp. 113, 245-246, 249-251, surveys the constitution of 1920; text, 565-581.

appointed by the head of the state (about 62). The Lower House had 260 deputies, elected since 1938 by secret ballot.

Local Government. The town and county municipalities formed a middle administrative organization of the state. The representative bodies and executives were elected by the inhabitants of the communities, the secret ballot having been introduced for men in 1886 and for women in 1929. The representative body in the communes and county-towns consisted half of members elected for six years, and half of persons who paid the highest taxes. But in the representative bodies of the town and county municipalities, the proportion of those who paid the highest taxes was reduced to two-fifths of the total number of members.

The Supreme Court in Budapest was the highest instance in all civil and criminal matters. There were six Courts of Appeal, and also the Patent Court in Budapest, the Administrative Court, and the Land Reform Court. The system of single judges was introduced in the county courts in 1921. The functioning of juries has been continuously suspended since 1914.

THE RISE OF HORTHY'S REGIME

In the interval between the Compromise and World War I, Hungary prospered; but politically she was unstable. The legislature was dominated by a small group of qualified voters, and the governmental candidates nearly always won at the polls. Electoral corruption and intimidation were rampant. The feudal clique took no notice of the national minorities who formed a majority of the population, and the only issue between the Liberal Party and the Party of Independence was whether Hungary should stick to Austria or try to win independence. Otherwise, all social reform was virtually left in abeyance. Count Stephen Tisza dominated Hungary and he was unable to see that the rule of the feudal aristocracy was outmoded.

When the Habsburg Empire collapsed in 1918, "the Red Count," Michael Karolyi, second largest landowner of the country, formed a new government. But Hungary's minorities refused to heed the pleas of Oscar Jaszi, his Minister of Nationalities, to stay in Hungary. The Czechs seized Slovakia and Ruthenia, the Romanians Transylvania and the Banat, and the Serbians

Croatia, Slavonia and the Backa. Karolyi lasted five months. Then in reply to an Allied demand to evacuate additional territory, he turned the governing power over to a combination of Socialists and Communists. This government soon developed into the purely Communist regime of Béla Kun. The "Lenin boys" terrorized Hungary; a Romanian army seized the occasion to march on Budapest and secure Romania's territorial demands.

Finally, the bloody Communist regime was ended by a conservative group under Admiral Horthy. More mass murders followed. The fury of the reaction vented itself with particular vehemence against the Jews. The country was weak for a decade afterwards, due to the successive "red" and "white" terrors.

Nicholas Horthy de Nagybanya was born in 1868. He was Austrian cruiser squadron commander in World War I, fought the British in the Otranto straits, and became Vice-Admiral in command of the Austrian fleet in 1918. He organized a White Army against the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1919, defeated the Communists and assumed the title of "Administrator of the Realm" in 1920. He twice refused (the second time by armed force) to support ex-Emperor Charles of Austria who came back to claim the throne. Horthy controlled both houses of Parliament. To the House of Lords he named 43 members outright and many more indirectly. His followers of the National Union Party absolutely controlled the lower House.

In 1919, during the civil war, he came riding into Hungary on a white horse (a performance which he repeated when Hungary reacquired Transylvania in 1940). His powers were undefined. He issued decrees, appointed judges and other officials. The Hungarian crown is a civil person, so that while it exists the Kingdom exists, regardless of whether or not there is a king in Budapest. For that reason in 1920 Horthy was elected Regent for life. In 1933 his powers were increased by conferring on him the rights enjoyed by the King to dissolve, close, or adjourn the Parliament.

Under Horthy there was only one real political platform in Hungary—the return of its Lost Provinces—a platform also accepted by all the Hungarian Nazis. All Hungarian political groups were committed to the restoration of "indivisible" Hungary, even if this involved the unwilling return of some non-Magyar minorities. This was in accordance with the Hungarian nationalistic ideology: the Sacred Crown of St. Stephen is still the source of all law, and all lands ever ruled by the Crown of

St. Stephen must be restored to the Kingdom. Economic distress, plus nationalistic pride, emotionalized the eternal cry of the Hungarians for this "revisionism," expressed in the slogan: "Nem, nem, soha!" (No, no, never). The children of Hungary were taught to recite: "I believe in one God, I believe in one Fatherland; I believe in one divine hour coming. I believe in the resurrection of Hungary. Amen." This propaganda gained some sympathy in England, but began to recede when Hungary started to incline to the Axis. But in this propaganda even the humblest peasant was in agreement.

After 1920, for the next 12 years, Hungary was governed by three magnate Prime Ministers—Count Teleki (July, 1920-April, 1921), Count Bethlen (April, 1921-August, 1931), and Count Gyula Karolyi (August, 1931-September, 1932). They found their support in the Party of National Unity, representing the whole propertied class. Count Bethlen's ten-year administration came to an end in 1931, and during the next five years the gentry and middle-class elements began to predominate. The government of General Gömbös (1932-1936) represented the gentry and anti-Legitimists. Gömbös showed marked sympathy with the rising power of Nazi Germany. On his death, he was succeeded by his former colleague, Darányi, who was confronted by many Hungarian Nationalist-Socialist movements, each appealing to the landless section of the population with promises of revolutionary agrarian and electoral reforms and offering to the official and professional classes (which were suffering from low incomes and a plethora of university-trained candidates for the very limited number of posts available) the panacea of anti-Semitism. These local fascists found support among the poorest peasantry and workers, the anti-Semitic middle classes, the unemployed intellectuals, and the Army. Against them were ranged the big landowners, the churches, the constitutionalists, the orthodox Social Democrats, and the Jews.

The incorporation of Austria in the Reich in March, 1938, brought in the government of Dr. Imrédy (1938-1939). Another aristocrat, Count Teleki, succeeded Imrédy in 1939. He declared his intention of carrying out Dr. Imrédy's policy, including anti-Semitic and agrarian measures. But the German influence in Hungary's internal affairs was steadily increasing; the government began to be obliged to make concessions to the German minority.

THE RAGGED GUARD

The struggle of Budapest for the "Lost Provinces" went on unceasingly, openly as well as underground. In 1919, a strange band of Hungarians called the *Rongyos Garda*—the Ragged Guard—was formed to fight for Hungary's postwar resurrection.⁷ Whenever Hungary wished to stir up trouble in the territories taken from her by Yugoslavia, Romania, or Czechoslovakia, the Ragged Guard went into action. These irregulars, dressed in odds and ends of military and civilian clothes, fought the Béla Kun Communist regime in Budapest. When the Trianon Peace Treaty gave beaten Austria a slice of territory from beaten Hungary, the Ragged Guard drove Austrian forces out of the town of Sopron. When peace settled in Central Europe, the Ragged Guard kept its existence as a sort of gentlemen's club. But it came to life again after the Munich Pact of September, 1938. Small companies of men in fur hats, knee boots, and sheepskin coats crossed the frontier into Ruthenia in eastern Czechoslovakia, spreading terror and bloodshed. They were the new generation of the *Rongyos Garda*, the sons of the guardists of 1919. When Germany invaded Poland they fought with the Poles, and many of them helped the Finns in their fight against Russia in 1939. They spread disorder and sabotage in Transylvania until Hitler forced Romania to return the northern part to Hungary in 1940. When Germany occupied Hungary in March, 1944, the *Rongyos Garda* started guerrilla fighting against the Nazis.

HUNGARY UNDER HITLER'S AUSPICES

In 1939, the "revisionistic" policy of Hungary was to bring results. Association with Nazi Germany seemed to promise Hungary the answer to territorial dissatisfactions. Hungary lined up with Hitler with a greedy eye on old possessions. The first dividend was paid off in March, 1939; Hungary grabbed Ruthenia when Germany swallowed Czechoslovakia. Then in satisfying succession came nearly two-thirds of Transylvania from Romania, and the Yugoslav Banat, granted to Hungary by Germany in

⁷ Robert Parker, *Headquarters Budapest* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944), p. 41.

reward for letting German troops march through to invade Yugoslavia in 1941.

But there were disadvantages to being a satellite. His country's treachery in aiding the invasion of her Yugoslav neighbor drove Foreign Minister Count Paul Teleki to suicide. In 1942, after successful campaigns in Russia, Hungary's troops met disaster supporting the German flank on the Don River before Stalin-grad. Ten Hungarian divisions were lost in the winter slaughter and thereafter the Hungarian army counted for little in Russia.

Nazism, strange to say in view of Horthy's alliance with Hitler, was anathema to Horthy and his reactionary followers. For them the rise of Nazism meant the ascendancy of the gutter element. But at the same time the Fuehrer represented the dynamic forces in Europe that would change frontiers. Horthy and his friends swallowed their pride and joined the Nazis. But they paid a stiff price. Horthy put his country's railways and munitions factories at Germany's disposal and promised to defend the Carpathians, with the Germans, against the Russians if there was need. In 1944, that need arose. Hitler had moved his soldiers into Hungarian Transylvania to try to hold the passes against the victorious Red Army. But the Horthy regime was unwilling to be reminded of its bargain of 1940, for Horthy's followers advised him to adopt the Darlan-Victor Emmanuel-Badoglio strategy.⁸

Collapse. The question confronting Horthy was how to make peace with the Allies while keeping the territories acquired with Hitler's help. But Hitler decided not to wait for Horthy's change of mind. At 3 A.M., March 19, 1944, German parachutists fluttered down in the dark on Budapest's and other Hungarian airfields. On the 50th anniversary of the death of Hungary's greatest nationalist and patriot, Louis Kossuth, German troops crossed Hungary's borders, smashing at resisting garrisons. Horthy's country was conquered by her erstwhile ally. The Germans first attempted to form a government under former Premier Béla Imrédy, then settled on Field Marshal Doeme Szotajay, Hungarian Minister in Berlin, as Premier with a Cabinet of ten reliable collaborators. They took the place of Premier Nicholas

⁸ For the Tibor Eckhardt's aspects of this strategy, see Joseph S. Rousek, "The 'Free' Movements of Horthy's Eckhardt and Austria's Otto," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, VII (Fall, 1943), pp. 466-476. The revelations at the Nuremberg trial show that Horthy had been informed of the intended conquest of Czechoslovakia before Munich.

Kallay's government, but the real authority, military and civil, rested with SS leader Dr. Edmund Veessenmayer, Field Marshal Baron Maximilian von Weichs, German commander-in-chief in the Balkans, and Hungarian industrialists. Horthy remained as a figurehead. In 36 hours Hungary had lost every vestige of independence. Its fate was the inevitable outcome of tortuous, opportunist diplomacy, the same fate that faced Bulgaria and Rumania.

HUNGARY UNDER THE RUSSIANS

In October, 1944, Horthy decided on a desperate gamble, helped in his decision by the thud of Russian feet marching toward Budapest. On the 15th, the Budapest radio reported that the Regent had announced acceptance of Allied armistice terms. Three hours later, Horthy was overthrown and a new Hungarian alliance proclaimed with Germany. A rabid Nazi, Ferenc Szalasi, was named Regent.

The new puppet government found itself beset on all sides. A reign of terror swept the capital and bloody clashes between pro-German and anti-German factions took place throughout the country. Horthy, his associates and family were, the German press reported, "enjoying the right of asylum" somewhere in the Reich. By early November Russian troops were within a few miles of panic-stricken Budapest, in a four-pronged offensive. The Provisional National Assembly, consisting of delegates elected in liberated territory under Russian auspices between December 13-20, met at Debrecen on the 21st to form a government. Professor Béla Zdedenyi was elected President of the Assembly and Gen. Béla Miklós Premier. On the 29th, war was declared on Germany. The new Premier promised that all resources would be mobilized against Germany, anti-Jewish laws abolished, land reforms introduced, and private enterprise safeguarded as the basis of economic life.

Armistice. The principal terms of the Armistice signed in Moscow January 20, 1945, between the Provisional Government and the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States, on behalf of the United Nations, were: Hungary undertook to disarm German armed forces and to make available such land, sea, and air forces as might be specified for service under the Allied (Soviet) High Command; all Hungarian troops were to be evacu-

ated from the territory of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Rumania; Hungary undertook to return all valuables and materials taken from United Nations territory and make good the losses caused to the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia by Hungarian military operations; the Vienna Arbitration Award of November 2, 1938, ceding parts of Czechoslovakia to Hungary and the Vienna Award of August 30, 1940, giving her northern Transylvania were declared null and void.

Following a fifty-day siege, the Red Army completed the conquest of Budapest on February 13, 1945. During May the new government returned to Budapest. Under the land reform, passed on March 17, 1945, all estates of over 1,000 *Katastraljoch* (one *Katastraljoch* is about 1.42 acres) were to be seized and others reduced to 100 *Joch* per owner; but the Roman Catholic Church and its institutions was to be allowed to retain 100 *Joch* each.

Political Trends. While elsewhere in Central Europe, the Communists dominated the Russian-sponsored governments—with control of the Ministries of Propaganda and Interior—in Hungary the only known Communists in the provisional government were Imre Nagy, Minister of Agriculture, and Minister of Public Welfare, Gabor. Conservative elements were represented by Count Teleki, Minister of Education. Other parties in the new Hungary were: the Social Democratic Party, two agrarian parties (the Smallholders and a newly formed party of hitherto landless peasants called the National Peasants Party), and two middle-class parties, Liberal and Republican).

In September, 1945, the Russian-Hungarian trade treaty was signed, although decided objections were voiced against it by the Western Powers in the London conference of Foreign Ministers. It was on the model of the arrangements made by Russia with Rumania and Bulgaria. This five-year pact called for the establishment of Russian-Hungarian companies on an ostensible 50-50 basis to administer Hungary's iron and steel industry, oil wells and oil refineries, power plants, chemical plants, factories for the manufacture of agricultural, electrical and other machinery, shipping on the Danube, and air and road transport. The arrangement promised "to be indistinguishable from the most flagrant imperialism ever practiced by the countries of the west in days when imperialism was being reprehended by Moscow." ⁹

⁹ John MacCormac, "Hungary Viewed as Loser in Pact with Russia Opposed by the Allies," *New York Times*, September 25, 1945.

At the end of September, 1945, the State Department formally announced the readiness of the United States to recognize Hungary, the provisional government having declared its readiness to offer the guarantees the United States had sought on free and untrammelled elections together with democratic freedoms that would enable a representative government to take office.

There was much discussion as to whether the regime in liberated Hungary was "democratic," as it called itself, or whether that patient word covered a mere dictatorship of the Communist party, acting in greater or less degree as the direct agents of Moscow. Certainly the Communists, and in part the Social Democrats, with whom the Communists were closely allied, were represented in the state and municipal offices far beyond their numbers. They also were the favored children of the Soviet authorities, who gave them support and facilities denied to the more conservative parties. The Communists, and especially their leader, Rákosi, repeatedly emphasized that they did not aim at dictatorship, but at collaboration in "a concentration of national forces."

The Elections. Contrary to prophecy, the elections of October 7, 1945, in Budapest, and the national elections of November 4, were clean, and although the parties of the Left certainly did not enjoy the undisguised defeat inflicted upon them, they stomached it for the time being.

There was a large vote for the moderate parties, and an absolute majority was returned in the National Assembly for the Smallholders Party, which now represented the Right wing of the "Independent Front" (the Bourgeois Democrats having been expelled by their colleagues and relegated to the Opposition). Government by coalition, apportioned among Smallholders, Social Democrats, National Peasants, and Communists, continued, under Zoltan Tildy, who agreed to give the portfolio of the Interior to a Communist, but declined to appoint a Communist to the Under-Secretaryship of the Interior, which the Communists claimed. On December 9, 1945, the National Assembly elected a Supreme Council of Three to exercise sovereign rights, headed by N. Nagy, leader of the Smallholders Party. A constitutional law of February 1, 1946, abolished the Monarchy and established a Republic. The same day Dr. Tildy was elected President of the Republic by the National Assembly, and four days later Nagy,

President of the Assembly and a leader of the Smallholders Party, was appointed Prime Minister.

East-West Struggle. The government coalition was faced by a desperate internal situation. The pengő dropped, by April, 1946, to 22 million to the dollar on the black market. The unsolved question was: was Hungary to be a western or an eastern democracy? The inspirers and directors of the campaign for the "eastern democracy" were Hungary's Communist leaders, a handful of men brought back with the Soviet armies in the autumn of 1944 (the Horthy regime had stamped out Communism in Hungary following the abortive revolution of Béla Kun in 1919). That these leaders did not fare badly was evident from the fact that they created in a few months a party able to poll nearly 17 per cent of the total votes cast in the national elections. Part of the Communist Party consisted of former left-wing Social Democrats, a large bloc of whom changed their colors as soon as opportunity offered; they constituted the most moderate elements in the party, but were outnumbered by recruits of a very different political past, many of whom were persons of violent tendencies and, very often, of an extremely dubious political past. A large number of them, only a year before, had composed the rank and file of Szálasi's extreme-Right Arrow Cross Party and had obtained their release from the internment, to which the new regime had subjected them, by signing a declaration that they had exchanged their former party allegiance for membership in the Communist Party. But the actual leadership was in the hands of the ex-émigrés popularly known in Hungary as the "Muscovites," or, alternatively, and somewhat unjustly, as the "Caviarists." This little group constituted the most important single factor in Hungary's politics in 1946 and 1947.

The "Western" camp was more heterogeneous and divided by profound differences. On the extreme Right of Hungarian opinion stood those elements which did not even form part of the Independence Front. These included a few small recognized political parties, the Bourgeois Democrats and the Radicals, Sister Margaret Szlachta's Christian Women's Camp, and the politically unorganized but formidable spiritual forces grouped around the uncompromising figure of the new Archbishop-Primate, Cardinal Mindszenty. The Smallholders Party, a notoriously mixed bag, contained, besides its original nucleus, a considerable faction which called itself Smallholders simply be-

cause that seemed to be the only effective way of registering conservatism. It was impossible to count either the Social Democrats or the National Peasants as forming in any sense a bloc with any of these elements.

In general, on the long-term issue of "eastern versus western democracy," the Communists had very few supporters outside their own ranks; indeed, not even all their own followers were "easterners" at heart. They were handicapped by the resentment of the Hungarians against the treatment they had received from Russia's forces. The resentment was even bitter among the small peasants, on whom the chief burden of the requisitioning had fallen, and on the workmen, who had most to suffer in some other respects, particularly by the removal of machinery and plants on war booty account. Finally, under the Potsdam Agreement, Russia became sole recipient of all reparations paid by Hungary—and the position of creditor is never a popular one.

There was also the Jewish problem, an ancient difficulty of Hungary. Many Communists and many of the political police were Jews, and many Hungarians felt that the Jews were using their opportunities to pay off old scores. The Communists insisted also on the maximum self-abasement for Hungary in the drafting of the Peace Treaty.

In general, then, the overwhelming mass of Hungary's population favored "western democracy," without wanting to bring a "reaction" in internal policy or an unfriendly policy towards the U.S.S.R. They wanted peaceful, progressive development on genuinely democratic lines, without dictatorship either from Right or from Left.

How these aspirations were to be worked out was a big question. Meanwhile, the Red Army had seized the Hungarian oil fields at Lisse, and the Russians forced Hungary increasingly to link its economy exclusively with that of the U.S.S.R. and satellite states. In July, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes invoked clauses of the Yalta Declaration to challenge Russian economic domination of Hungary. He demanded that Russia agree to joint United States-British-Russian planning for the reintegration of Hungary in an all-European and world economy. The Russians ignored the request.

Communists Move Toward Dictatorship. The impending withdrawal of Soviet occupation forces and inability to make political

headway by democratic methods led the Communist Party leaders in January, 1947, to launch a movement for the imposition of a Communist-controlled minority dictatorship. An alleged reactionary conspiracy among Right-wing members of the Smallholders Party provided an excuse for wholesale arrests of leaders and members of the majority party by police under the control of the Communist Minister of Interior. Supported by the Russian military commander, he acted without consulting non-Communist members of the Government. Numerous army officers favoring cooperation with the Western democracies rather than Russia were also arrested. Meanwhile, the Communists, who appeared to be losing much of their support among the voters, obtained the postponement of scheduled communal and factory council elections.

Results of Land Reform. The law partitioning large estates was the most important of the reforms introduced by the republican regime. It provided about 500,000 families of landless or almost landless peasants, comprising one-third of the total population, with small plots of land. In a country in which 52 per cent of the population depends upon agriculture for a livelihood, this reform meant not only the end of the semi-feudal landed estates but a complete change in the social structure.

Peace Treaty. The peace terms imposed on Hungary by the Allies, acting through the Big Four Foreign Ministers Council, were published January 17, 1947. Hungary was required to pay an indemnity of \$300,000,000, mainly in the form of products and equipment, of which the Soviet Union was to receive \$200,000,000 and Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia \$50,000,000 each. The transfer of northern Transylvania to Romania and the return to Czechoslovakia and Russian-owned Ruthenia of all the territories annexed in 1938 and 1939 was confirmed. An added 40 square miles was also ceded to Czechoslovakia. With the latter exception, Hungary's new boundaries were the same as those fixed in the Treaty of Trianon in 1920.

Hungary's military strength was limited to 65,000 men plus an air force of 90 planes and 5,000 men. The treaty provided that all Allied forces would be withdrawn from Hungary within 90 days after the treaty went into force, except for Red Army forces needed to maintain lines of communication with the Soviet zone of occupation in Austria.

RECENT TRENDS

The Peace Treaty brought, however, no "peace" to Hungary. Moscow's answer to the Truman Doctrine was to force out of office all pro-Anglo-American politicians within the Soviet sphere of influence. In Hungary this was done by getting rid of Premier Nágy while he was vacationing in Switzerland. He headed a broad coalition, within which Social Democrats worked closely with Communists to counterbalance the influence of the majority Small Landholders Party. A Communist minority forced a change in government; on May 29, 1947, Nágy phoned his resignation to Budapest after obtaining assurance that his young son would be released. The new Cabinet, headed by Lajos Dinnyes, also of the Smallholders, was installed on May 31; Tildy remained President.

The ousting of Nágy was but another round in Hungary's internal war which, according to the Soviet scheme, was to have Hungary go eventually the way of Bulgaria and Romania. The Small Landholders Party, holding half the Cabinet posts and a majority in Parliament, and speaking for most of the peasants, plus remnants of the old aristocracy, the landed gentry, and the clergy, was strongly anti-Communist and anti-leftist. But in order to stay in power it had to make a deal with left-wingers, the Social Democrats, and the Communists. The former wanted a planned economy and nationalization of the banks; in this they agreed with the Communists, the latter, however, resenting their idea of gaining loans from abroad to finance imports of raw materials and capital equipment.

These trends were opposed in Washington, which withheld part of a small United States credit and protested to Russia over the Communist maneuver and the way Nágy was forced out of office. (Nágy eventually found refuge in America.) Washington also suspected that Matyas Rákosi, Communist leader, Soviet citizen and Deputy Premier, was the most important political figure in the Cabinet. As months of his régime went by, several other pro-western leaders escaped abroad. The government purged the army of "disloyal" elements, pushed the nationalization of banks, and elaborated a three-year plan for socialization of industry; the invitation to participate in the Marshall Plan was declined.

A new electoral law was protested, on August 17, 1947, by the United States and Great Britain; both countries accused the

Budapest Cabinet of fixing the election by disfranchising a million anti-Communist voters. But the government went ahead with its original plans. The elections of August 31, using plural voting by Communists and disfranchisement and intimidation of their opponents, made the voting a farce. The Communists won 18 per cent of the seats, as compared to 17 per cent in 1945; but the Smallholders, who won 57 per cent in 1945, fell to 13 per cent. The second largest group was a new "surprise party" of Istvan Barankovics; other factions were of no importance.

The coalition of Smallholders, Peasants, Socialists and Communists carried on under Dinnyes, in spite of the smoldering resentment of many Socialists and Smallholders. Hungary was not, as yet, a one-party state, although all the methods of intimidation of that kind of a state were used; in fact, Hungary was surely moving along the course charted by the shrewd and patient Communist Matyas Rákosi. Along that line, also, Hungary, like Bulgaria, concluded a mutual aid pact with Tito's Yugoslavia in November, 1947. By 1948, Hungary's people's majority might be opposed to sovietization, but the government was securely in the Soviet camp.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALMOND, NINA, and LUTZ, R. H., *The Treaty of Trianon* (Palo Alto, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1935). A careful review of the history and provisions of the Treaty.
- APPONYI, ALBERT, and others, *Justice for Hungary* (London: Longmans, 1928). Hungarian propaganda on behalf of "revisionism."
- ECKHART, FERENC, *A Short History of the Hungarian People* (London: Grant Richards, 1931). Factual and brief.
- JASZI, OSCAR, *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary* (London: King, 1924). An important account of the three Hungarian revolutions of 1918-1919, by one of Karolyi's ministers.
- KOSARY, D. G., *A History of Hungary* (New York: Benjamin Franklin Bibliophile Soc., 1941). Events up to 1940 by a Hungarian professor.
- MACARTNEY, C. A., *Hungary and Her Successors* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1937). One of the most dependable studies.
- MONTGOMERY, JOHN FLOURNOY, *Hungary, The Unwilling Satellite* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1947). A naive appraisal of Hungary's problems during the last fifteen years, by the U.S. Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Hungary, 1933-1941, who was quite impressed with his contacts with the "great ones" of the country.

- PRIBICHEVICH, STOYAN, *World Without End* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1939). Probably the most valuable survey from the standpoint of social history.
- VAMBERY, RUSTEM, *The Hungarian Problem* (New York: The Nations, 1942). A Hungarian Liberal attacks the ruling clique of Hungary. Enlarged in *Hungary—To Be or Not To Be* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1946).
- WISKEMANN, ELIZABETH, *Prologue to War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1940). A dependable account of the Reich's penetration of the Danubian countries.
- WOLFE, HENRY C., *The German Octopus* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran, 1938). Chapter XVII is an excellent journalistic account of Hungary's general problems.

THE BALKANS

In general, there are four definite types of governmental and political systems in the world today. They are: (1) the two-party system in use in the United States and Great Britain, (2) the multi-party system emphasizing politics mainly in terms of ideologies presenting social issues, in vogue in France and other European democracies, (3) the one-party dictatorships, such as those of the Soviet, Spanish and Portuguese regimes, and (4) systems based essentially on the dominating personalities of outstanding political leaders, which still prevail in the Balkans despite the recent imposition of the one-party system in the countries under Russian control. The Balkan brand of politics closely resembles that developed in Latin America.

Balkan politics can be understood only in the light of direct action unashamed of its "illegal" or "undemocratic" methods. Yet nowhere does one listen to such floods of eloquence on the intrinsic value of parliamentarism and constitutionalism. The *régime personnel* provides the marked discrepancy between the symbolic value of constitutional terminology and the widespread disregard of democratic formulae in practice. Freed only during the last century from foreign subjection, the Balkans have tried to imitate the political methods of Western Europe and to import the glittering phrases of constitutionalism, parliamentary government, and democracy. Unfortunately, there was no socio-political background for the successful operation of these importations. The rulers and politicians who prided themselves on their innovations forgot that the English parliamentary system had taken centuries to establish itself, that it assumed its form by experiments, by the method of trial and error, with the result that it developed both the special attitude and habit of conciliation. The fundamentals of the political system are commonly accepted, and Parliament is not concerned with their redefinition or drastic alteration. Hence, in England, parliamentary debates tend to focus on policies, not on basic principles. The parliamentary institutions here are also supported by an efficient civil

service outside party politics, at the disposal of whatever government is in power, and by a cabinet designed to interlock the executive and the legislature by means of the party system.

Nothing could be more remote from the social climate of British parliamentarism than the conditions prevailing in the Balkan countries when enthusiastic progressives were permitted to copy the best governmental features of England, France, and Belgium. To reassure themselves, they wrote lengthy constitutions elaborating a form of parliamentary democracy. That the results were unimpressive is not surprising.

The Balkan states, in short, have developed political systems which are sharply at variance with both the principles and the efficacy of democratic government—coming nearer to dictatorial than to representative methods. The power and control are maintained primarily by force, theoretically justified as the natural evolution from, and a better substitute for, a bankrupt and discredited regime that has come to a close. Civil rights are unredeemed promises. Roughly speaking, all Balkan governments have won all elections ever since they first began to imitate parliamentary practices. The only exceptions were the result of really revolutionary changes of public opinion; and, in the post-World War II days, with the Soviet army everywhere at hand (except in Greece), nothing of that sort could be expected to show itself in the Balkans.

Paradoxical situations appear here time and time again. While monarchies are becoming *passé* in the world, in the Balkans a monarchy was established in Albania during the first "democratic" decade in Europe after World War I, and the revolutionary cycle in Greece led to the restoration of the monarchy in 1946.

The absence of a broad structure of public opinion providing political education for the peasant masses and the chaos of futile struggles in inefficient and troublesome representative assemblies have contributed to the demand for a "strong hand." In addition, the widening gap between the peasantry and the upper classes has resulted in hatred and bitterness. Confronted with fundamental cleavages of opinion, Balkan parliamentarism could not make itself the mediator of these differences. The political parties are dominated by "intellectuals," whose personal ambitions and feuds are more important than the interests of the country. Perhaps nowhere are designations more apt to be

misleading than in the vernacular of Balkan parties. Thus Romania's Liberal Party is really the conservative party in the country; the Party of Free Thought of Greece's Metaxas tolerated only its own free thought; Bulgaria's Radical Party was really the conservative party of the middle classes; and so on down the line.

As political contests in the Balkans are dominated by personalities, it is natural that here politics is entirely a matter of private gains and prestige. Since everybody who is anybody in the Balkans is in politics, and there are not enough jobs for the ever-growing number of "intellectuals," revolutions are always in the making. Sometimes a group of army officers dictate political changes by violent methods—a respectable mode of political action in the Balkans.

Although the basic pattern of Balkan governments and politics has remained under Russia's tutelage, another paradox has cropped up here since Russia's domination began to be felt at the end of World War II. In the Balkans, radicalism has never been so much a doctrine as a state of mind. Since everywhere the peasant forms the majorities of the population, conservatism is really the most stable and persistent ideology of the most conservative element. The peasant wants to retain whatever land he may have—and get more of it. Yet, the pro-communist regimes are now haunting the Balkan scene—except in Greece. Partial solutions are probably the future answer here again, but again only in the Balkan way—which uses bullets rather than ballots to determine political issues.¹

¹ For more details and specific information, see: Joseph S. Roucek, *Balkan Politics* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, Cal., 1948).

ROMANIA

GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

The Romanians claim to be descendants from the ancient Romans, and in fact, speak a Latinate language in some ways closer to classical Latin than modern Italian. But they have been so trampled and rent and exploited by nearly every other people that have ever passed across southeastern Europe, that today they are a mixture of Scythians, Dacians, Thracians, Greeks, Romans, Goths, Huns, Bulgars, Slavs, Tartars, Petchenegs, Cumens, Hungarians, Poles, Turks, Armenians, Saxons, Alsations, Jews, Gypsies, and Ukrainians. All these strains are combined in the people who now speak the Romanian language.

As a nation, the Romanians finally emerged in 1290 as a people called the Vlachs, led by Rudolph the Black Prince, who was a chieftain in the mountains of Fagaras. Rudolph won a moment of freedom for them from the Hungarians and Turks, but the darkness soon settled over them again. Briefly again, in 1600, Michael the Brave united the Romanians on both sides of the mountains—the curving line of the Carpathians and Transylvanian Alps which cuts Romania in half from north to south. (Everything to the west of the Transylvanian Alps belonged to the Austro-Hungarian Empire before 1918; it is this portion which the Hungarians wanted returned after 1918. They got most of it—by the grace of Hitler—only to lose it again when Stalin returned northern Transylvania to Bucharest.) Later, as the Turkish Empire swept up through the Balkans toward Vienna, the Romanians were absorbed by the Sultan's government.

The Romanian nation first formed a state of its own at the time of the American Civil War; it won complete sovereignty in 1881 under King Carol I. The Romanian armies were destroyed by the Germans in World War I, but as they were allies of winning nations and good bargainers, the Romanians nearly doubled the size of their country through the peace treaties of 1919-1920.

In the period following World War I, Romania tried to secure her new possessions. The ever-present menace of a Hungarian or a Russian revanche (Romania had acquired Bessarabia from Russia) caused Romanian statesmen to orient their foreign policy in favor of a guarantee of the status quo and of security—a problem of international and far-reaching importance to all the small states of Europe.¹ But as World War II approached, the Romanians found themselves under the first Carol's grand-nephew, King Carol II, in the path of Nazi-Germany's "Drive to the East." They lost most of their prized possessions and became a battleground between the Russian and Nazi armies at the end of 1944.

Romania, with one-sixth of the population of Germany of the pre-World War II days, produced almost as much wheat on the fertile plateau of Transylvania and on the black soil of Old Romania, as was grown in Germany. Far more oil and natural gas was produced there than in all the rest of non-Soviet Europe, although poor management wasted 75 per cent of it. The oil bubbled out of the ground east and west of Ploesti (which appeared in the news of World War II when it was bombed by American airmen in 1943 and 1944) on the south side of the Transylvanian Alps, before the Predeal Pass. And Romania also had coal, iron, lead, zinc, copper, mercury, bauxite, aluminum, antimony, gold, silver, salt, and graphite. It had only lately begun the long process of learning to exploit and use these resources.

Social Conditions. Romania is still an overwhelmingly backward agricultural country trying hard to learn about machinery.² The inadequate transportation facilities have always been a great problem in Romania. The problem of the peasantry was further complicated by the exceptionally low prices in foreign markets for agricultural products between 1930 and 1938, the lack of capital and credit, and the over-indebtedness of the peasantry. Although great strides have been made in education, the problem

¹ Cf. Joseph S. Roucek, *Contemporary Roumania and Her Problems* (Stanford University, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1932), Chapter VIII, "Roumania and Her Neighbors," pp. 135-182; Roucek, *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939), Chapter IX, "Balkan Foreign Policies," pp. 152-164; Joseph S. Roucek, "Danubian and Balkan Europe," Chapter XV, pp. 326-355, in Francis J. Brown, Charles Hodges, and Joseph S. Roucek, *Contemporary World Politics* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1939); P. B. Stoyan, *Spotlight on the Balkans* (New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1940).

² David Mitrany, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1930) is a searching analysis of this whole problem.

of enlightening the masses is one of paramount importance. The peasant masses, as elsewhere in the Balkans, are the chief suppliers of the ever-growing groups of intelligentsia and professional people. The leadership of city life was headed by Bucharest which imitated with desperate determination the Parisian example. Most of the other cities of Romania seemed to be really overgrown villages, though they presented different aspects because of their different historical experiences.

After World War I, the most urgent, important move of the government was to give land to the people. Nearly 90 per cent of Romania's farm land is owned by the peasants, who compose 80 per cent of the population. Much of this land was taken from the Hungarian and Tsarist aristocrats and from the Catholic Church whose properties Romania had obtained control of in the peace treaties of 1919-1920. Romanian oil attracted capital from Britain, France, Italy, and the United States; and oil and wheat brought from Germany great quantities of machinery. Romania considered itself a civilized nation.

Minorities. Scattered among Romania's 18,000,000 people were more than 5,000,000 who, by ancestral habit, spoke eight other languages. In Romania, as everywhere in Eastern Europe, groups of people lived side by side for hundreds of years without agreeing upon a common language. Villagers may never in a lifetime leave their native village. The language of the diplomats and the cabaret girls—French in Romania—meant nothing to these peasants. Though Poland had a greater total of minorities, no nation had a wider or a more dangerous variety of minorities than Romania. There were 2,000,000 Hungarians (who once ruled Transylvania), 250,000 Turks (who once ruled all Romania), 1,000,000 Ukrainians (who once ruled Bessarabia), 300,000 Bulgarians (who once ruled Northern Dobrudja and who secured its return during World War II), 800,000 Germans (who read Nazi newspapers), 900,000 Jews (who nearly disappeared during World War II), and some 30,000 Tartars and Gypsies. In addition, there were the mountain Macedonians.³

Romania's minorities were not citizens in quite the same sense that Romanians were, and the problem agitated the postwar

³ After World War I the Romanian government invited back to Romania groups of Macedonians who had emigrated to the United States, and settled them on Romania's most troublesome frontier, facing Bulgaria. There they built neat villages on the American plan.

politics of Romania as well as foreign opinion.⁴ They did not have equal opportunity in all respects or equal representation, although constitutionally all rights were granted to them. When King Carol abolished representative government in February 1938 for all Romanians, the minorities were just as badly off as the Romanians, although Carol, alarmed by the Nazi appeals to the minorities, promised them in August 1938, more freedom to teach their children their native language in native schools, to worship in their own way, and to engage in business on more equal terms. This was no bill of rights, merely a temporary list of concessions. It was soon qualified by a list of restrictions on Jews and on all religions except the Greek Orthodox. These forced the opening of business of all Jewish merchants in Bukovina on their Sabbath (Saturday) and the closing of 1,500 Baptist churches.

HISTORY

Romanian nationalists assert that their people are descended in a straight line from the ancient Romans; this dogma of racial origin is closely related to the claims of the Romanian state to its largest and richest province, Transylvania.⁵

The legions of Emperor Trajan conquered Dacia—a region comprising present-day Moldavia, Wallachia, and Transylvania—between 101 and 107 A.D. In 274 A.D., Emperor Aurelian abandoned Dacia. Yet the infusion of Roman blood and culture had transformed Dacia into a truly Roman land, the Romanians assert. The arrival of the Magyars in Transylvania in 1003 led to the subjugation of the Transylvanian Romanians by this Asiatic tribe; but the majority of the Transylvanians managed to preserve their racial and linguistic characteristics despite centuries of Magyar domination.⁶

While Transylvania remained under the rule of the Hun-

⁴ Cf. Joseph S. Roucek, *Contemporary Roumania and Her Problems*, Chapter IX, "The Problem of Minorities," pp. 183-214.

⁵ Robert Srausz-Hupé, "Rumanian Nationalism," *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 232 (March, 1944), pp. 86-93; Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944), pp. 529-530, 537, 717 ff.

⁶ For the opposing, that is, pro-Magyar thesis, see above note, *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87; Joseph S. Roucek, *Contemporary Roumania and Her Problems*, pp. 3-5; Eugene Horvath, *Transylvania and the History of the Roumanians* (Budapest, 1935), pp. 5-9.

garians up to 1918, the Romanians boast of Michael the Brave who united the three Principalities (Wallachia, Moldavia and Transylvania) in 1599. The region of Mihaiu was the culminating point in the medieval history of Romania; thereafter the country was under Turkish influence, and the freedom of the elections of the Princes was gradually restricted by Constantinople. The Sultan farmed out the administration to the so-called Phanariotes—rich Greek merchants and bankers inhabiting the Phanar, or lighthouse quarter of Constantinople. The Phanariote period (1711-1821) was a heavy economic strain upon the provinces. The anti-Greek hatred engendered by the financial exactions of this period still remains in Romania today.

But the Phanariotes brought with them all the leavening influence of French literature and culture. The contact with French civilization roused in the Romanians the sleeping Latin spirit, and the younger generation flocked to Paris, drawn there, too, by liberal ideas. In this respect, the two Romanian provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia were in a different position from other parts of the Balkan Peninsula; they were not directly incorporated into the Turkish Empire. Preserving their aristocracy, they resembled Russia, Hungary, and Poland in social structure more than Serbia and Bulgaria, whose people had become purely peasants. Thus, in the 18th century, the Princes accepted the French cultural ideas, and French revolutionary ideas penetrated to the Romanian aristocracy through the Greek merchants established in Vienna. In 1791, as a result, some of the *boyars* (nobles) in Wallachia demanded the right to form a nation and to elect a native Prince.

However, a modern national consciousness began only when Gheorghe Lazar, coming in 1816 from Transylvania to Bucharest as director of the school of St. Sava, propagated the theories of Bishop Micu and substituted the native vernacular for Greek as the language of instruction. But years of patient effort were required before a part of the Romanians of the provinces understood the efforts of Lazar and began to found schools with teachers imported from Transylvania. The Romanian language, which so far had been the language of the lower-class peasant, was becoming more appreciated and more widely used in the principalities.

In the 19th century, the Greek influence was declining and that of the Russians growing. The Romanians did not like the Rus-

sians, but welcomed them in 1828 when war broke out between Russia and Turkey. The Treaty of Adrianople (1829) granted virtual autonomy to the principalities, although the Russians occupied the country for a number of years. The revolutionary wave of 1848 also touched the Romanian provinces. It was Romanian good fortune that the views of Napoleon III of France coincided with the nationalistic principles propounded by the Romanian agitators abroad. At the Paris Congress of 1856 the union of the principalities was suggested as a barrier against Russian expansion. Finally, the treaty of March 30, 1856, gave back to Moldavia three of her districts of southern Bessarabia (annexed by Russia in 1812).

The National Party, determined to elude all the restrictions on complete union, elected Colonel Alexandry Ion I. Cuza as the Prince of both principalities in 1859, and he was recognized grudgingly in 1861. Prince Cuza lasted seven years (1859-1866); his personal vices and the unconstitutionality of his acts forced him to abdicate. The German Prince Charles (Carol I) of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was imported to succeed him.

Independence. In 1867 came the Russo-Turkish War, which enabled Romania to declare her independence. A year later, Russia annexed the southern part of Bessarabia, and Romania acquired southern Dobrudja. In 1881 Charles proclaimed the Kingdom of Romania. In the Balkan Wars, Romania acquired the rest of Dobrudja from Bulgaria. King Charles died in October, 1914, and was succeeded by his nephew, Ferdinand, who declared war on the Central Powers in 1916. Most of Romania was occupied by the Germans and Romania had to sign the Bucharest Treaty of May 7, 1918, one of the forgotten documents which indicates what Germany would have done to the conquered nations had she won the war.

World War I. The results of World War I enabled Romania to realize her nationalistic ambitions and transformed her into "Romania Mare." The nation, separated for over one thousand years, became a political unit. The former Roman Dacia, built up by Emperor Trajan, came out of its historical grave, after 1,500 years, to live again—only to become, within two decades, an objective in the power politics between Nazi Germany and Stalin's Russia.

World War II. By 1940 Nazi "tourists" had Romania already well in hand. On June 26, 1940, the U.S.S.R. presented an ultimatum.

matum demanding the satisfaction of her claims regarding Bessarabia and northern Bukovina. On June 28, the Russian troops took over the ceded territories; Romania thus lost about 17 per cent of its area (19,300 square miles), and an estimated population of 3,500,000. (But in the German attack on Russia, that began on June 22, 1941, and in which Romanian troops participated, the Romanians not only re-took Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina, but also conquered Russian territories. On October 18, 1941, a decree was issued incorporating Odessa and an area beyond the Dniester into Romania; the region became known as Transdnistria.)

On August 30, 1940, by the award of Vienna, made by the Foreign Ministers of Germany and Italy, Romania ceded to Hungary the territory of northern Transylvania (17,370 square miles). On September 8, by the Treaty of Craiova, Romania had to give southern Dobrudja (some 3,000 square miles) to Bulgaria. By these cessions, Romania lost nearly 40,000 square miles of territory and 4,000,000 inhabitants. As a Nazi satellite, Romania declared war on the Allies in 1941.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Romania, just like the other Balkan states, has had several constitutions, all of them honored more in the breach than in observance.⁷ The 1923 Constitution was an effort of the Liberal Party (actually the most conservative party) to provide a document which would correspond theoretically to the democratic demands of the times, and, at the same time, to safeguard against too much democracy by extreme conservative provisions. For example, the democratic provisions for the election of the House of Deputies were counterbalanced by the extremely complicated

⁷ See: Joseph S. Roucek, *Contemporary Roumania and Her Problems*, Chapter X, "Constitution and Administration," pp. 217-246, and bibliography, pp. 403-404; Joseph Delpech & Julien Laferriere (F. R. Dareste & P. Dareste), *Les Constitutions Modernes* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), Vol. II, pp. 351-354; Herbert F. Wright, *The Constitutions of the States at War 1914-1918* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919), p. 517; Andrei Radulescu, *L'Influence Belge sur le Droit Roumain* (Bruxelles: A. Puvrez, 1932); A. I. Andrews, "The New Constitution of Roumania," *Current History*, XVIII (1923), pp. 11017-11024; D. Mitrany, "The New Rumanian Constitution," *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, VI (1924), pp. 110-119.

and most conservative provisions governing the election of Senators. The usual civil and political rights were actually not granted. The executive power, centralized in the person of the King, by far overshadowed the legislative power. Just like the Vidovdan Constitution of Yugoslavia, the Constitution tended toward centralism, disregarding the anti-centralistic demands of the new provinces (particularly Transylvania). In actual practice, the Constitution was frequently modified in its actual application to the exigencies of the political life of the country.

Constitution of 1938. Another Romanian constitution was adopted on February 27, 1938,⁸ decreeing that Romanian citizens, regardless of racial origin and religion, were equal before the law. No Romanian could advocate in speech or in writing a change in the form of government or in the distribution of the wealth of others, exemption from taxes, or class trouble. The clergy could not use their ritual authority for political propaganda; all political associations based on religious prefects were forbidden. The members of the Senate might be nominated by the King or elected, in some cases for life; the number of nominated members was equal to that of those elected. A Senator's term was nine years. The Chamber of Deputies was elected for six years. All male and female citizens of thirty years whose profession was agriculture, manual work, commerce, industry or intellectual work were electors for the Chambers; Senators had to be elected by citizens over forty years of age, and required the enumerated professional qualifications. The King had a suspensive veto over all laws passed by Deputies and the Senate. A Minister must have had an ancestry of three generations of Romanians. The regime was accordingly authoritarian in character under the Constitution of 1938.

Carol's Departure. With the abdication of Carol II on September 6, 1940, there was established the dictatorship of Ion Antonescu, who with German support, established the Iron Guard (the Fascist Party of Romania) as the only recognized party. Antonescu took the title of *Conducator*, and Romania became a German vassal state. On September 6, the Constitution of February 27, 1938, was abolished; on September 16, Romania was proclaimed a "National Legionary State."

⁸ A. R. Ionascy, "La Nouvelle Constitution Roumaine," *Revue de Transylvanie* (Cluj, Roumania), V (1939), pp. 421-447.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

For purposes of local government, Romania was divided into 58 districts administered by prefects, receivers of taxes, and civil tribunals; the districts were subdivided into 6,662 communes (16 municipal, 139 urban, 27 suburban and 6,480 rural); the rural communes comprised 13,418 villages and hamlets. The most important towns, called *municipii* (municipalities) had autonomous communal organizations. But in September, 1940, the powers of all local authorities were taken over by the Minister of the Interior.

POLITICAL PARTIES

If we are to characterize briefly and also superficially the internal politics of Romania in its past and present stage of development, we shall state that the moving spirit of its political behavior has been strong personalities, rather than definite political programs. Men, not principles, have in general determined the political conduct of Romania.⁹

This reliance on personalities is the result of the educational, economic and political standards of the people of Romania. Long centuries of Turkish domination told their story when Romania began to move toward independence. These years of struggle made them a nation, but gave them no training for self-government. The masses of the peasantry were endowed with the qualities of patience, perseverance, and endurance peculiar to an agricultural race. The expression of political life fell to the lot of the two groups, the Liberals and the Conservatives, which, though insignificant in number, became the political mainsprings of the prewar Kingdom. Their roots were not very deep in the soil of Romania, and, hence, they could hardly build up any wide political ideology. The Conservatives represented the great landowners, rich and influential individuals, each of whom felt qualified and destined to be the leader of his group. During World War I the Germanophile Conservative, Alexandry Marghiloman, was Prime Minister when the Germans occupied the coun-

⁹ Joseph S. Roucek, "The Political Evolution of Roumania," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, X (April, 1932), pp. 602-615; Roucek, *Contemporary Roumania*, Chapter VI, "Character and Basis of Roumanian Politics," pp. 61-100; Roucek, *The Politics of the Balkans*, pp. 26-54.

try. His signature of peace with the Central Powers in May, 1918, was really the political death-warrant for him and his party, the social basis of which had already been destroyed by the land reform.

Prewar Politics. The pre-World War I political life of Romania, just like the ten postwar years of Greater Romania, was mainly dominated by the National Liberal Party, or rather by its leaders, the Bratianus. Its membership was composed of the ruling classes of Romania. Public offices and liberal professions became, for the most part, preservers of the Liberal Party. They were imbued with the spirit of nationalism and mercantilism and favored an industrial and financial development of Romania. Still dominating the party, the Bratianus did not hesitate when World War I broke out to stand energetically against the Germanophile King Carol I. Ion I.C. Bratianu convinced Carol's successor, King Ferdinand, with the aid of Queen Marie, to join the Allies, and the victory of World War I added to the reputation of the Bratianus.

Post-World War I Period. When the Conservatives went to pieces after the war, the Liberals were pushed to the Right of Romanian politics. The place on the Left was filled by the National Peasant Party, the most democratic political group of the Kingdom (with the exception of the Socialists). The party united the peasant forces of the Old Kingdom, Transylvania, and other provinces; but they were unable to gain the control of the government until after the death of King Ferdinand (1927).

The Peasantry versus the Liberals. The population and territory of Romania were more than doubled as a result of the first war; the inhabitants of the new provinces being added to the Kingdom were not so readily impressed with the prestige of the Bratianus as were the inhabitants of the Old Kingdom. Furthermore, the peasant of Greater Romania was now threatening the absolute rule of Ion Bratianu. The peasant was not only given the land reform, but also was granted universal and compulsory suffrage—a measure which was fully justified in the post-war days and which looked askance on anything not associated with that magic word “democracy.” Equipped with the weapon of democracy, the peasants from the provinces, due to their long political experiences, were now more than insistent on their demands. In the prewar days the electoral system had presented no worries to the government in power; now the full

vote granted to the peasant could oust the Bratianu group. So with one hand, democracy was offered on a gold platter to the peasants; on the other hand, the application of the measure was taken away. The Second Bratianu, with a profound and, no doubt, perfectly sincere conviction in his mission, proceeded to "correct" the electoral intents of the peasants by the "making" of elections.

This, then, represented one line of division in the first post-war decade of Romania. The peasant masses, at first inarticulate and disunited, were massed against the domination of the Liberals, headed by Bratianu, who represented the non-peasant interests—the banks, the professional men, the politicians, the industrialists—in fact the vested interests of the Kingdom. Fundamentally, it was a struggle between the forces for mercantilism and those for agrarianism.

Carol and the Liberals. The second line of division very soon materialized. Prince Carol, who later became King Carol II, and the Second Bratianu, had their outstanding differences to settle. In the first round the Prince lost against the combined forces of the Court, Queen Marie, and the scheming Bratianus. The differences between the Prince and Bratianu came to a head at the end of December, 1925, when the heir to the throne left his country abruptly and renounced all his rights. But let us add that Carol's exclusion from the succession was more in the nature of concessions to Bratianu and to opinion outside of Romania, than a penalty imposed by Romanian social standards.

By this time the situation was growing tense. The Liberals made their own elections and the peasant population of Greater Romania was finding out that the Liberals were up to their old tricks—favoring the vested interests in the big cities by whatever means were both expedient and convincing. The peasants found that they could vote only if they were prepared to vote their way under the threat of force. Worse, even, was the fact that the small peasant could get no financial support from Bucharest, except at exorbitant interest rates. Crown Prince Carol, we must note, was one of the first men to take up the cudgel on behalf of the peasant, but whether he was actuated by hatred of Bratianu or by regard for the peasantry is a question difficult to decide. At all events his own folly and the astuteness of his enemies soon encompassed his downfall.

Regency. The place of Prince Carol was taken now by little

Prince Mihai, Carol's son, and a Regency Council was named in the event of King Ferdinand's death. Except for a short interval under the governments of Premier Averescu and Prince Stirbey, Bratianu ruled the country. His assumption of the Premiership in 1927 resulted, as is usual in Romanian politics, in the holding of general elections, but under such corrupt circumstances as to return a huge majority of Liberals, a fraud which infuriated the peasants.

Spirit of Irreconcilability. At this point we must consider another feature of Romanian politics. Except on polling day when the electors are objects of special solicitude of the governmental representatives, the electorate tended to be ignored by the Romanian politicians, who relied, when in opposition, upon monster demonstrations to convey to the King the idea that the time had come for a change of government. Furthermore, the party animosity is carried to extremes—as in most Balkan countries. The political struggles were conducted after the manner of a minor civil war, and the victors were tempted to get the spoils of the victory by arrogating to themselves an authority not altogether consistent with constitutionalism, unless their ambitions were kept in check by a higher power—the Crown. The party in opposition, knowing its impotence once its opponent was appointed to power, had its attitude fanned to passions of white heat, and the spirit of irreconcilability was infinitely strengthened.

Maniu's Interlude. By 1927 a succession of events began to undermine the strength of the Liberals. King Ferdinand died in that year, and in November Bratianu followed him to the grave. The Third Bratianu, Vintila, became the head of the Liberal Cabinet. But the economic situation, the result of the mercantilistic policy of the Liberals in the postwar years, was fast becoming precarious. Bratianu's attitude toward the dynasty and his personal hostility to Prince Carol were regarded as still further endangering the situation. The National Peasant Party was convinced that nothing would solve the situation but an absolute overthrow of the Liberals under whose long and corrupt regime and veiled dictatorship they had been chafing. The Regency, of which Prince Nicholas, a brother of Carol and his decided supporter, was a member, decided to give the National Peasant Party a chance under Juliu Maniu, who assumed the Premiership on November 9, 1928.

But the rule of Maniu, the true representative of the peasant, was badly handicapped by the hold of the Liberals on the economic life of the country. The Premier realized, after eighteen months in office, that with an invertebrate Council of Regency, he could not depend upon a fair trial for new order. He felt that the return of Prince Carol would allow the establishment of the King who might conceivably fill the role of an arbitrator between the political parties. The Romanian people, suffering from the world economic depression, were now also ready to welcome any radical change. It is true that the National Peasant Party had held an election in 1928 which was considered as really free. But the economic situation was getting worse. The Third Bratianu was launching fresh attacks on the government and on the Prince. The National Peasant Party leaders decided to bring Prince Carol back to Romania and place him on the throne. This they did in 1930.

CAROL II

The family chart of the Royal House of Romania shows the amazing influence Britain's Queen Victoria had on the royalty of Europe. In 1881 the European powers picked a Hohenzollern to become King Carol I of Romania. Carol II was his grand-nephew, a Hohenzollern with a half-English, half-Russian mother, the beautiful Queen Marie. When Marie became Crown Princess of the new and backward kingdom of Romania in 1893, she felt that her enormous talents were wasted. It turned out otherwise, for Marie was most effective behind the scenes at Versailles in 1919 in making little Old Romania the Greater Romania of the day.

Carol's father, Ferdinand, in spite of his Hohenzollern ancestry, was forced to declare war on Germany in 1916 by the Bratianus, thus causing the Kaiser to disown him. He had already become the buffoon of the courts of the world. The politicians of postwar Greater Romania had little use for his son Carol. The latter's liaison with red-headed Magda Lupescu, a Roman Catholic girl of half-Jewish descent, did not lessen their hostility. Carol's divorce from his wife followed a hot-tempered telegram sent to the Bratianu government from Vienna during a sojourn there with his mistress. It was gladly accepted as a renunciation of all rights to the throne. Thus when his father

Ferdinand died in 1927, Carol's son Michael became King at the age of six, ruling through a regency until Carol claimed the throne three years later.

After his flight home to regain the throne, Carol suddenly, and amazingly, seemed to mature. He succeeded in concentrating the power in his office by compromising, and replacing the leading politicians; even Maniu, who had exacted definite promises, was soon forced to resign. For a period of time, internal crises resulted in a frequent succession of Premiers, all growing out of the controversy over the position which the King was to occupy in the constitutional scheme. The Premier was not necessarily a member of the majority group in Parliament. After his appointment, he was provided with the means of "making" an election, an event that was closely supervised by governmental authorities and provided Carol's candidate with a following in the next Parliament. Thus, the views of the electoral body were of minor importance. The final decision remained in the power of the King, resulting in the paradox of electoral victories of Prime Ministers who might have no electoral following. Little attention was paid to the will of the people; the attempt at introducing democratic methods made by the National Peasant Party was totally defeated.

The dictatorial and fascist tendencies of the Romanian system were identified with the electoral law which was introduced by the Liberals in 1926. According to its provision, the party receiving more than 40 per cent of the total votes was given 60 per cent of all the parliamentary mandates, and parties receiving less than 2 per cent of the total votes received no mandates whatever. The system afforded several advantages and disadvantages. The newly appointed government holding the elections did not have to use force as extensively as would be necessary in obtaining an absolute majority. Any effective opposition was silenced, and the government could easily ride roughshod over all opposition votes. On the other hand, the small parties saw readily the hopelessness of their situation, and they either used extreme demagogical methods, which added to an already discordant situation, or they concluded electoral agreements with other parties, usually the government, without any substantial unity in program. Such alliances could not present any clearly defined program. Furthermore, the system encouraged the leaders, anxious to be elected into the Parliament as members

of the government, to change readily their political allegiance; and personalities were substituted for programs. To these defects must be added the tendencies of the electorate to vote for the government approved by appointment through the King.

The organization of the Romanian parties was naturally quite loose. The strongest party in this respect was the Liberal Party, which had considerable funds at its disposal, while the other parties called upon their wealthy members for support at elections as well as for subsidies for the party press.

PUBLIC OPINION

The center of political gravity is Bucharest. If all the Balkans is proverbially a hotbed of rumors, Bucharest is the true capital of scandeldom. The individuals talk bitterly of their political opponents, and, strangely enough, the idea of according the members of the Royal Family any protection from scandalous tongues, in view of the impossibility of their taking such measures as are open to ordinary citizens to protect themselves, is entirely foreign to the Romanian legal code. Newspapers are accustomed to attacking the members of the Royal House with extraordinary violence. But this cherished privilege has since been withdrawn.

The same spirit prevails in public life: scandalous and vitriolic accusations are freely printed. Personal abuse climbs to a high pitch, and reckless and sweeping statements about men in public affairs are openly used. The influence of the newspapers is very important because the periodicals are read with interest even by the lowest classes of the nation.

Peasant Mentality. The peasant masses, although interested in the affairs of the state and politics, are really indifferent. The peasant knows that all the glib promises of the politician who has invaded his tranquil villages are nothing more than the promises which have been repeated and will be repeated at every election. The game of politics is very confusing to him, and he finds a point of understanding in the complex social situation by centering his affection upon the Royal House, which represents for him sentiment and something larger than politics. Generally good-natured, he appears reserved to strangers; but when his anger is aroused, his acts are terrible—as exemplified by the Romanian uprisings.

He complains about corruption in politics, but he knows he can do nothing about it. He is, however, more self-conscious of his political strength than the peasants of the remaining Balkan countries—with the possible exception of Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. On the other hand, he is rather afraid to participate in politics too much, knowing that the victory of his leaders might be superseded tomorrow by the victory of his opponents, who know how to make his life miserable. In fact, his relations with the state and its representatives are very distasteful to him. The endless hours of waiting for a chance to transact some official business with a bureaucrat are a great waste of time. Moreover, he knows that his transactions with the state officials are expensive. In many parts of the country, bureaucracy appointed *en masse* in reward for party service, finds itself in these creditless days dependent upon corruption alone. Public opinion refuses to become indignant even over corruption in high places, and appreciates the ingenuity with which minor officials use their posts as an alchemist's stone to compensate for inadequate salaries.

Upper Classes. At the other end of the social scale can be found the middle and upper classes of Romania. When Romania became independent, there arose a great need for men with any schooling whatever. They were quickly absorbed by the state. This suited them perfectly, because the upper-class Romanian has the natural dislike of landed people for mercantile occupations which were left to the foreigner to develop, and especially to the Jews. But soon public offices and liberal professions were looked upon as the only occupation for the educated Romanians, who retained positions or made new ones for themselves by political manipulations and had little real interest in the peasant. In contrast to the middle classes of the Western European countries who rose on the wave of the industrial and commercial revolution, the Romanian middle classes at first actually represented the political needs of their country, and then their personal ambitions. Represented by the Liberals, they aimed before the World War to curtail the political power of the landlords, and in this they eventually succeeded. The agrarian reform rang the death-knell of the *boyars*. About the same time the Liberals, for nationalistic, rather than economic, reasons, initiated the mercantilistic policy which has left the peasant masses poor and greatly broadened the abyss between the peasants and the middle classes.

Strictly speaking, Romania has no large genuine middle class.

What we are discussing here are the members of the liberal professions and public officials, with whom are allied the sprinkling of industrialists and bankers. Their number is constantly growing, as the supreme ambition of every educated Romanian is to enter one of the liberal professions or public offices. This explains the extreme bitterness in politics. The radical changes which each new government makes in the administrative positions cause the political jobs to become not only insecure but also highly appreciated. It would seem that the country is so undeveloped that there would be room for the employment of many thousands of young intellectuals, such as doctors, lawyers, administrators, and business organizers. But the trouble lies in the fact that they all want to live in Bucharest, if possible, and become politicians by all means. Surely, the government which, after the last war, filled the higher schools with the peasant boys on free scholarships, did not know that the majority of these would grow up to be violent reactionaries and join a Fascist, anti-Semitic organization known as the Iron Guard.

When talking to these representatives of the middle classes, their indifference to the problems of the peasant and their tendency to "look down" upon him is quite obvious. It is true that Romania has many educated men who are genuinely interested in the difficulties which the peasant has to face, but many politicians—as everywhere else—are really demagogues who use constantly such words as "democracy", "equality", etc, in their public pronouncements, although in private they are willing to admit their contempt for the "ignorant peasant."

As is the case in other Balkan countries, Romanian politicians are mostly lawyers, physicians, and members of the liberal professions. There are not so many generals and army men in the lower house (if compared with the other Balkan lands), probably because they are taken care of in the Senate.

CAROL'S DICTATORSHIP

Although Carol supervised personally the rapidly shifting cabinets, matters were steadily growing worse. With the assassination of Premier Duca by the Iron Guard in December, 1933, Romania's fascism dominated the scene. In the previous period the dynamic element had been the desire of the peasants, despite

their natural dislike for politics, to have a voice in the government more nearly proportionate to their numbers. Between 1933 and 1940 Romania's politics were characterized by a struggle for power between Carol and the Iron Guardists, the latter supported by Germany. Zelea Codreanu, son of a Polish father and a German mother, the founder of the Iron Guard (known also as "The League of the Archangel Michael"), rode about the country on a white horse, a crucifix in his hands, a revolver at his belt. He began his career in 1923 by shooting the police prefect and two gendarmes when he was restrained in promoting anti-Jewish riots. By 1930 the 50,000 activists—students, young physicians, lawyers, priests, university professors, retired army officers, and general riffraff—meant business. Their appeal lay in their anti-Semitism and its denunciation of Carol's Jewish consort. As a movement aiming at "basic change," it had great attractiveness to unemployed intellectuals and academicians. Lubricated with the money advanced by foreign powers, it prospered on domestic uncertainty and palace intrigue.

In 1935, the trend toward fascism was strengthened by the formation of the National Christian Party out of the union of the National Agrarians, led by the Transylvanian Octavian Goga, and the Christian Defense League, led by Professor Cuza. When, in the election of December 21, 1937, Premier Tatarescu polled only 38.5 per cent of the vote—less than the 40 per cent needed to control Parliament—Carol tried to save the situation by appointing a Cabinet dominated by the National Christian Party. The Iron Guard was ignored. Popular hostility forced Carol to appoint a Cabinet of National Union on February 10, 1938, headed by the Patriarch, Dr. Miron Cristea, and consisting largely of former Ministers. On the death of Cristea, Calinescu was appointed Premier, the King governing by decree. Carol's new Constitution of February, 1938, was approved by a "popular" plebiscite and on April 14, 1938, all political parties were dissolved in favor of a single party, the Front of National Rebirth. Thus Carol achieved the role of the *Fuehrer* as well as King.

The Iron Guard continued to be a nuisance to Carol. The King had Codreanu and several of his followers arrested in April, 1938. On November 30, while being transferred from one place of confinement to another, Codreanu and his associates were shot "while attempting to escape."

ANTONESCU'S DICTATORSHIP

A period of violence and civil disorders followed, carefully nurtured by Hitler's agents and money. Following the loss of Bessarabia, northern Bukovina, and Transylvania in 1940, Carol found himself unable to control the situation and let himself be maneuvered into asking General Ion Antonescu to become Premier. Antonescu, in turn, insisted on Carol's abdication. Carol escaped, pursued by the revenge-bent Iron Guards, in a truly spectacular fashion in September, 1940. At the same time he abdicated in favor of his son, Michael (Mihai). Antonescu had always been affiliated with the anti-democratic forces of the country. His followers included some of the most rabid Fascists in Europe. It surprised no one when, after dissolving Parliament, Antonescu established a totalitarian state with himself as Fuehrer, and proclaimed the Iron Guard as the only political party in Romania. A month later, in October, 1940, German troops were sent to occupy the country, and, especially, the oil fields. Antonescu's signing of the Axis Pact on November 23 merely confirmed Romania's policy of the two preceding months. In 1941 Romania joined Germany in the attack on Russia.

Marshal Antonescu found it difficult to convince all the Romanians of the "goodness" of his rule. The opposition, limited in its sabotage activities and still largely under cover, was nevertheless becoming stronger every day. He found it necessary to have himself appointed supreme judge, so that all justice in Romania could be invested in him alone. Persons accused of economic sabotage were either executed or sent with their families to Transdnistria (the area generally including Bessarabia and the rest of the territory beyond the Dniester River, almost to the Axis-held Russian city of Odessa).

ROMANIA SWITCHES TO ALLIED SIDE

In the early half of 1944 Romania became a battleground, due to the advance of the Soviet armies. On August 23, London broadcast the electrifying news that the kingdom had accepted Allied armistice terms and ended her war with the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States.

For more than two years the Romanians had entertained the

hope that they might find in Washington and London protection against Soviet ire at the hour of final settlement, and that Washington and London would help them to retain Bessarabia, which the Romanians reconquered in 1941 with Hitler's help. Juliu Maniu, the aged and respected leader of the Romanian National Peasant Party and the greatest hope of Romanian and Allied democracy, hoped even in 1942 that the Allies would permit Romania to recover and conserve not only his native Transylvania, but both Bukovina and Bessarabia. He expressed these views in lengthy secret memoranda which his friends transmitted to Allied agents in Ankara. But the Allies excluded any negotiations not fully approved by the Soviet Union; this was the response received in Cairo by Prince Barbu Stirbey, who in April, 1944, attempted to obtain American and British "protection" for Romania. The Soviet conditions were then communicated to Stirbey. The Romanians would be permitted to recover northern Transylvania but they would have to give up Bukovina and Bessarabia.

The Red Army's offensive in August, 1944, forced King Michael to inform Allied headquarters in Cairo of his decision to quit the Axis camp and become a co-belligerent with the Allies, following the principles laid down by the Russians and approved by the United States and Britain. On August 23, Michael executed a *coup d'état* against the dictator, had him arrested and imprisoned in the small vault of the royal palace where Carol used to keep his stamps. Besides Premier Sanatescu, the new Cabinet included Juliu Maniu, George Bratianu (leader of the Liberal Party), Lucretiu Patrascanu (Communist), and Constantin Petrescu (Socialist). On August 25, Romania declared war on Germany. In September, 1944, Lucretiu Patrascanu signed an armistice in the Kremlin which took Romania officially out of her war against the Allies and into an approved war against Germany and Hungary; she had a promise of the return of Northern Transylvania if she did her part in recapturing that rich, disputed region from the Hungarians.

The coalition government of Premier Sanatescu (with the Peasant Party, Liberal Party, Communist and Socialist representatives) withdrew all anti-Jewish measures and suppressed the fascists, but political chaos continued. The Romanians expected the Allies to treat their country as a member of the United Nations, but this hope proved to be unfounded.

PRO-SOVIET REGIME

In April, 1944, Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov assured the world that the Red Army's entry into Romania had been "dictated solely by military motives." To allay widely-held suspicion that other motives had also influenced Russia's insistence on strategical dominance of the Balkans, Molotov added: "The Soviet government does not pursue the aim of acquiring any part of Romanian territories or of altering Romania's social and economic status as it exists today."

At the Yalta Conference ten months later, Marshal Stalin joined with Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill in issuing that declaration on liberated Europe. Among other things, that document promised concerted action on the part of the Big Three Powers "in assisting" the liberated peoples of Allied and satellite countries alike: (1) "To solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems;" (2) "To destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice;" and (3) "to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

The trouble with the Yalta Declaration is that the Soviet interpretation of such key phrases as "democratic means," "democratic institutions" and "democratic elements" is altogether different from that of Britain and the United States. Nowhere has this unpleasant fact been more in evidence than in Romania.

The conflict between the coalition government and the Communists burst into the open on February 24, 1945, when large groups of armed Communists of the Communist-inspired National Democratic Front attempted to overthrow the government. The King was unable to appoint a government due to continued unrest in the country. In the spring, 1945, a new Romanian Cabinet was created under the direct supervision of Andrei Vishinsky, Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs, who told young King Michael whom to appoint. Dr. Petru Groza became Prime Minister and started to carry out the policies of his masters.

Groza's Regime. Groza, a husky, good-natured, bald-headed man with curious cauliflower ears, was the head of an organiza-

tion known as the Plowmen's Front, but was far from being a plowman himself. He was in reality a middle-aged Transylvanian businessman who had long opposed the Peasant Party leadership. He came from the town of Deva, where he owned three hotels and the local bank, in addition to several thousand acres of farm land which he deeded over to the peasants who used to work for him. He also owned a small textile factory in Sighisoara and a distillery in Arad. Groza's opponents accused him of having given away his land and joined the National Democratic Front in order to protect his more important properties. No one denies, however, that Groza, like General Radescu, his predecessor in the Prime Ministry office, had been confined in a concentration camp when Antonescu was in power.

Thus one of the richest men of Romania, whose party had never been able to send a single representative to Parliament or even to elect anyone to a county office, appointed a Cabinet under the strict control of the Secretary-General of his office, Emil Bodnaras, a powerful and very able Communist, who had spent much time in Russia.

Thereafter, Romania was actually run by the Russian Ambassador in Bucharest, the Russian General heading the Allied Control Commission, and four local Communists, three of whom came from Russia after Romania turned against Hitler and joined the Allies. "Rumanians are milder than Bulgarians and do less killing. They show more national unity, love their nation more, fear Russia more and have fewer native Communists. Of four Communists exercising dictatorship over Rumania only one is of Rumanian origin."¹⁰ Yet, the Foreign Minister, George Tatarescu, had committed practically every political crime that Communists excoriate the world over. He directed and subsidized pogroms against Jews, suppressed Peasant and Communist leaders, helped King Carol to establish a dictatorship on a Fascist model and conducted Romania's worst election. He also concluded the first major agreement in the series of treaties delivering Romania economically to Nazi Germany.

In Romania, where Communists are only 2 per cent of the population, the regime had to move rather cautiously, but it

¹⁰ Reuben H. Markham, "Bullies in the Balkans," *Collier's*, CXVIII (September 7, 1946), p. 19 ff.; see also Leigh White, "The Soviet's Iron Fist in Rumania," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXVII (June 23, 1945), p. 18 ff. Notice that the official spelling of the country's name is Romania, rather than the more popular Rumania.

moved effectively. There was popular King Michael, who, with Marshal Tito, was the only Balkan leader to receive the exalted Soviet Order of Victory medal. There were only two divisions of Romanian troops repatriated from Russia by 1946—after proper indoctrination. They constituted an incipient praetorian guard. And there were the three real leaders of the Romanian Communist Party, all able and none of them native Romanians. The three: Emil Bodnaras (real name Bodnarenko), a Ukrainian from Bessarabia; Laszlo Vasile Luca, a Hungarian from Transylvania; and Ana Pauker, a German-Jewish Communist whose husband was formerly an official of *Amtorg* (Russian-American Trading Co.) in Manhattan. The brains of Romania's Communist Party, Comrade Pauker lived handsomely in her Bucharest villa.

National Democratic Front. On January 28, 1945, the NDF published a ten-point social and economic program similar to the program in force in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. The program included land reform, compulsory education, the purging of "Fascists" from the army and government, the raising of living standards for workers and peasants, and the betterment of relations with the Soviet Union.

Groza's Reforms. As elsewhere in the Balkans, the peasants are the most important element with which the Communist-dominated government has to deal. The Soviets realize that they cannot break Balkan resistance until they subdue the villages. One device is land distribution which accomplishes several political aims: it weakens and threatens the small group of larger farmers who provide the capital with a fair proportion of leaders; and confiscation of land undermines the principle of the inviolability of private property. Groza started to give the land out in a haphazard way. Members of his Plowmen's Front got the first choice, and its membership soon jumped from a few thousand to a million and a half. But the peasants received inadequate amounts—under five acres each—with no machinery, stock or credit. The Soviets also helped by allowing Groza to take over the control of Northern Transylvania. The anti-Communist press was suppressed, and soon for the Romanian man in the street there was no more freedom of expression than under the Nazis.

Meanwhile Romania's resources were further drained by paying Russia two-thirds of her reparations debt in ten months fol-

lowing the armistice instead of spreading it over six years, as had been agreed. Inflation was on the march. The Russo-Romanian trade treaty was also quite harsh; Romania was to pay the piper and Russia was to call the tune. The so-called *Sovrom* companies were organized to control the oil industry, air and river transport, and banking. In January, 1945, acting on a decree entitled "Conscription for Labor in the U.S.S.R. of Romanian citizens of German Ethnographical Origin," the Allied (Soviet) Armistice Commission began deporting 70,000 persons of German origin to central Asia; and 36,000 refugees who had fled from Bessarabia in 1940, prior to the Soviet occupation, were removed to other parts of the Soviet Union. Antonescu was executed, with many others, and Iuliu Maniu, the 73-year-old President of the National Peasant Party, went into retirement, seeing no chance of a free election.

In September, 1945, the Soviets eased the armistice terms for Romania by agreeing to a "request" for the return of Romanian railway equipment, the restoration of part of Romania's Black Sea and Danube shipping fleets taken as prizes, and reduction of Romania's \$300,000,000 reparations debt. The agreement was intended to make Russian domination a little more palatable to Romanians, who still worried about such items as free elections and United States-British opinion. (Russia's first grab for tighter control of the government had been blocked in 1945 when the London and Washington governments threatened not to recognize the Romanian government if the elections were rigged.) When, in the fall of 1946, after a long period of careful preparation, electoral lists were once more announced, Maniu and the National Liberal Party leader, Constantin Bratianu, claimed that the lists had been drawn up in such a way as to favor the Soviet-sponsored candidates.

The electoral campaign followed the same pattern as in the other Russian-dominated countries of Eastern Europe and the Balkans, despite repeated protests by the Opposition parties and by the United States and British Governments. The Groza government employed violence, intimidation, bribery, manipulation and falsification of the returns to prevent the free expression of the national will. After the voting on November 20, 1946, the government bloc announced that it had received two-thirds of the votes cast and captured more than four-fifths of the seats in Parliament. Both the British and United States government de-

nounced the Groza regime's conduct of the elections as a violation of the formal pledges of free elections which it gave in January, 1946, in order to obtain recognition.

Peace Treaty. The text of the peace treaty for Romania drawn up by the Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R., United States, Great Britain, and France was published on January 17, 1947. It required Romania to pay \$300,000,000 to the Soviet Union, mainly in goods and equipment. The cession of northern Bukovina and Bessarabia to Russia and of southern Dobrudja to Bulgaria was confirmed, as was the annexation of northern Transylvania by Romania from Hungary. Romanian armed forces were limited to a land army of 120,000 men; anti-aircraft artillery with a personnel of 5,000 men; a navy with a total tonnage of 15,000 and a personnel strength of 5,000; and an air force of 150 planes (100 of combat type) with a personnel strength of 8,000.

RECENT TRENDS

During 1947, Premier Groza was directed by a Communist triumvirate—Ana Pauker, Vassili Luca, and Emil Badnaras—all three trained in Moscow. The Communists controlled all key posts—Interior, Communications, Justice, Economic Reconstruction and the post of Vice-Governor of the National Bank. All opposition was muzzled and several leaders arrested. The National Bank was nationalized and government control of all industry for the next five years was approved.

The country was, however, on the edge of economic disaster. It suffered the worst famine in fifty years, costing the lives of thousands; Washington's emergency shipments of food saved between 500,000 to 2,000,000 people. The combined toll of drought in 1945, and Soviet exactions left little for the people of Romania. Communist reforms failed to increase farm or factory output and reparations were sucking into the U.S.S.R. most of what the country produced.¹¹ While the government distributed 3,300,000 acres of large estates among 870,500 small farmers, the smaller plots and the general dislocation helped to cut food output, aggravated further by shortages of fertilizers, draft animals, tools and transportation. Oil output was down to 25,920,000

¹¹ In normal years, Romania exports grain, but the corn crop of 1946 was only 28 per cent of average and the wheat harvest 63 per cent.

barrels a year—compared to a prewar level of more than 45,000,000 barrels—and was steadily falling; Russian removal, lack of equipment, and a drop in exportation helped this decline. The oil properties owned by American, British, and French capital were forced to sell oil on terms set by the government, and the domestically owned companies were run by a joint Soviet-Romanian oil concern. Industry was in the doldrums.

The Passing of Maniu and of King Michael. In the early stages of their Romanian adventure, the Communist leaders had orders to keep hands off Michael and old Iuliu Maniu, leader of the anti-Communist Peasant Party. In November, 1947, Maniu was cornered by Groza's government and sentenced (together with Ion Mihalache, Vice President of the Party) to life imprisonment. The trial yielded some evidence that Foreign Minister George Tatarescu (forced to resign and replaced by Mme Ana Pauker, one of the two Romanians who had helped to set up the nine-nation Communist Information Bureau) allowed confidential information and documents to reach Maniu's pro-Western group. Washington protested—but with the usual useless results.

That put Michael's number up. The King had earned black marks in the Communist ledger for objecting to some of the cabinet's decisions and for going out of his way to make overtures of friendship to the western democracies. But most of all, the Communists remembered the role Michael had played in unseating another foreign-bossed dictator, Ion Antonescu, Romania's number one Quisling.

In November Michael left Bucharest for five weeks to attend the wedding of the British Princess Elizabeth. While he was away the Communists laid their plans. Michael returned, and as 1947 waned, moved to his castle in the country at Sinaia (about seventy miles from Bucharest) to spend the Christmas holidays with his mother. But on December 29, an urgent telephone call from Premier Groza ordered Michael to return to Bucharest. There, the next morning, the King found his palace under heavy guard by police and picked Soviet trained troops. At about 10:30 A.M. he received Premier Groza—and from him, a six-paragraph proclamation of resignation ready for signature.

Michael cogitated until 1 P.M. on his position. He was popular with the masses, still sentimentally fond of their recollections of the chubby boy who first became King at the age of 6 in 1927. Many recalled how he, singlehanded, switched Romania from

the Axis to the Allied camp in 1944. On the other hand, the Soviets were constantly breathing on his neck; he had to give in to Andrei Vyshinsky in 1945 when he presented Kremlin's ultimatum demanding Groza as Premier. Thereafter Michael was not too successful in slowing down the progressive sovietization of Romania, succeeding only enough to incur Moscow's mounting displeasure. Now the Russians were telling him, in effect, to sign or else.

Michael signed.¹²

After the King announced his abdication, a Communist spokesman stepped up to the microphone to read a proclamation declaring Romania a "popular democratic republic." Michael departed for western Europe.

Balkan's Latest Republic. The reactions of the United States were expressed by another note of protest of February 4, 1948. The State Department notified Bucharest formally and tersely that it had failed in every respect to live up to its pledges of a democratic government stipulated in the peace treaty with that country. Its contents represented a virtual indictment of the Communist-controlled government for acts involving virtually the whole range of suppression of freedoms presumably guaranteed by the Romanian government in its commitments made as a part of the Treaty of Peace. The State Department recalled that Premier Groza had explicitly pledged his government to the principles of freedom of the press, speech, religion and assembly, and recognized the freedom of operation of all the major political parties, following an agreement reached in Moscow in December, 1945, aimed at broadening the Romanian government to include them. Despite these promises, the note went on, there were not free elections for a new government; instead, there were intimidation and coercion. There had been no equitable distribution of newsprint to Romanian newspapers nor equal allocation of time on the radio for speeches and debates by candidates for office, the note declared.

Moscow's conquest of Romania was now complete.

¹² By losing his crown, Michael gained, however, the right to marry the woman he loves, a twenty-six-year-old blonde Danish Princess, Anne of Bourbon-Parma, who once sold hats at New York's Lord & Taylor, fashionable Fifth Avenue store.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CLARK, CH. U., *United Roumania* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1932). Valuable for a survey of various aspects of Romania's life, including literature.
- GHYKA, M. C., *A Documentary Chronology of Roumanian History* (New York: William Salloch, 1942).
- GRAEFENBERG, R. G., *Athene Palace* (by "Countess Waldeck") (New York: McBride, 1942). Lively picture of Bucharest in the dramatic days before Carol stepped out and Hitler stepped in.
- IORGA, MICOLAE, *A History of Roumania* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1926). The standard account in English of Romanian characteristics and national history. Not particularly well organized, and rather slight on the recent period.
- KORMOS, C., *Rumania* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1945). Economic and historical facts about the people and the country; the book went to press before the Russians invaded Romania.
- MADGEARU, VIRGIL, *Rumania's New Economic Policy* (London: King, 1930). A National Peasant leader explains the attitude of his party toward agriculture, tariff, capital, etc.
- MARIE, DOWAGER QUEEN OF ROMANIA, *The Country That I Love* (New York: Brentano, 1925). Chatty sketches of people and places, including shrewd appraisal of the former Romanian rulers, King Charles and "Carmen Sylva."
- MITRANY, DAVID, *The Land and the Peasant in Rumania* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930). The agrarian problem in its historical and social setting.
- PATMORE, DEREK, *Invitation to Roumania* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939). A pleasant picture of the country, the people and their problems, by an Englishman impressed with the historical function of the feudal aristocracy.
- PAVEL, PAVEL, *Why Rumania Failed* (London: Alliance Press, 1944). A National Peasant's Party representative surveys Carol's rule.
- ROUCEK, JOSEPH S., *Contemporary Roumania and Her Problems* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1932); *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939), Chapter III, pp. 26-54; *Central-Eastern Europe* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946). Chapters VIII and XXII, pp. 193-198, 492-505.
- Roumania Ten Years After* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1928). Social and political conditions as seen through the eyes of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities.

YUGOSLAVIA

GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

The American reader of Louis Adamic's *My Native Land*¹ realizes how difficult and complicated postwar problems will continue to be, not only in Yugoslavia but in all of Europe. Throughout Adamic's book Yugoslavia appears as a portent of the world of tomorrow. A revolutionary war over moral, economic, and social questions has made this country one of the most perplexing military and political problems for United Nations strategy.

The internal dissension which is today dividing Yugoslavia is nothing new to that unhappy land. Although the country as we know it today was a creation of the peace treaties following World War I, the regions lying within its present boundaries have for centuries been torn by strife from within and from without. Like the other Balkan countries, Yugoslavia has long been a pawn in the hands of major powers of Europe, and has figured prominently in the wars of the past. It is not without significance that the "incident" which precipitated World War I, took place in Sarajevo, which is now located within the boundaries of Yugoslavia. There, on June 28, 1914, the Austrian archduke, Francis Ferdinand, was assassinated by Serbs who sought to bring about the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and to increase the power of Serbia.

The inhabitants of present-day Yugoslavia were living under six different governments at the start of World War I, a fact which makes it difficult to trace the country's history, but which also accounts in large part for its constant friction and strife, including that of the present. Serbia, the nucleus of the new state, was itself once a powerful European nation which struggled long and hard to push back the Turks in their struggle for domination of the continent. Finally, in 1389, in a battle still commemorated in song, the Turks defeated them, and, like the rest of the

¹ Louis Adamic, *My Native Land* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1943).

Balkan Peninsula, Serbia became a part of the Ottoman Empire.

Geography. Yugoslavia's importance lies largely in its geographic location. It is a highway between central Europe and the Middle East. It is not without importance that the railroad line between Vienna and the Adriatic ports and the line from the Middle East to western Europe intersect in Yugoslavia. During World War II, the great armies again met on Yugoslav territory, with the Allies seeking to enter the heart of Europe through this historic route.

Although only slightly larger than the combined areas of Pennsylvania and New York State—less than 100,000 square miles—Yugoslavia has a population of some 14,000,000, is of infinite topographic variety, and sprawls across many climates, embracing many cultures.

Economics. The country is extraordinarily wealthy in minerals of all kinds which, however, are still in need of proper exploitation. Its coal deposits are estimated at more than five billions of tons. The deposits of iron ore are enormous. Yugoslavia ranks first among all the European countries in regard to copper deposits, and third in manganese ores. The forests are also of importance to Yugoslavia, covering almost one-third of the total surface of the country.

Economically, Yugoslavia is essentially an agricultural country with fully three-quarters of the inhabitants of the country normally engaged in farming. Like Romania and other central-eastern European states, Yugoslavia has carried out a large-scale land reform. Consequently, the agricultural system is that of the small peasantry.

But the general predominance of an agricultural population must not obscure the fact that the social structure of Yugoslavia varies in the different provinces. Thus, in the Voivodina, Croatia, and Slovenia, an urban population has arisen, due to the economic conditions of these sections. Here the growth of trade and industries has been much more rapid than in Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, and Herzegovina.

Social Conditions. The fact that Yugoslavia is predominantly mountainous (four-fifths of its area is covered with mountains and hills, located primarily in the south and southwest) is important. During the centuries of Turkish domination, the Serbs were able steadfastly to oppose the conquerors by retiring to the mountains and waging guerrilla warfare. The valiant struggle of the

Yugoslav guerrillas during World War II was nothing new to this land, for much of its history is filled with similar struggles against a stronger power.

In but a few states in the world has the increase in population been as high as it has been in Yugoslavia. However, the rate of mortality has also been high. These conditions are closely connected with the high rate of illiteracy, which ranges from 20 to 86 per cent. The low standards of education have made the peasant ignorant, superstitious, and provincial, and unwilling to employ the modern methods of cultivation. One of the most interesting survivals of the parochial community, the *zadruga* (a community of blood relatives who own and work their properties together under the administration of a family chief by tacit consent), still flourishes in some parts of Yugoslavia.² Above the masses of the peasants is found a small cluster of the foreign-educated urban element, imitating the Parisian or Viennese dress, maintaining a western European standard of living and keeping a marked social distance from the peasant.

MINORITIES

Though known as "The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes" when first created after World War I, the country's name was changed in 1929 to Yugoslavia, meaning the Kingdom of Southern Slavs. Historically, it had been Serbia's ambition to unite all the southern Slavs into a single group. However, the many invasions and the general migrations of population caused so many racial groups to be scattered throughout this corner of Europe that it was impossible to draw the lines in a way that would unite all the southern Slavs without including other racial groups.

Consequently, Yugoslavia has contained a greater conglomeration of peoples than any other nation of Europe. Of the total prewar population of some 14,000,000, approximately half were Serbs, 2,500,000 Croats, more than 1,000,000 Slovenes, 550,000 Macedonian Slavs, 450,000 Magyars, 250,000 Albanians, 150,000 Romanians, about 1,000,000 Germans, and a considerable sprin-

² See: P. A. Sorokin, C. C. Zimmerman, and C. J. Galpin, *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1932), Vol. II, pp. 57-67.

klings of other racial groups. Approximately three-fourths of the population is of Slavic origin, the other fourth being divided among various groups. In a small village of Yugoslavia, as many as eight different nationalities have been found living side by side.

HISTORICAL DIVISIONS

The land of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes lies at the crossroads of the European western and eastern worlds. The Roman Empire was divided in the middle of this land. Rome and Byzantium fought each other at the moral and political expense of the southern Slavs, who became separated not only politically but also along religious lines. The Serbs and Bulgars accepted the Greek Orthodox Church in the seventh and eighth centuries. At that time, the acceptance of a religion had deeper implications than a simple act of faith; it was at once a philosophical and political *forma mentis* which dominated the whole life of a nation.

The Serbs built their state upon an absolute union between the king, the Church, and the military class. The Croats, and later the Slovenes, accepted the way of thinking of the medieval, feudal western European world, where since the beginning the tendency had been to separate the temporal power from the spiritual. Thus, the Serbs cannot easily accept federalism as a political philosophy and are always striving for the centralization of the state.

The medieval Balkan states were overthrown by the Turkish invasion of southeastern Europe. The Turkish domination still further separated the Serbs from the Croats, the latter remaining under the Austro-Hungarian sphere of influence. Until the twentieth century, the lands of the southern Slavs were shared by the Austro-Hungarian and the Turkish empires.

Kosovo Spirit. The conflict with the Asiatic Turks created a national philosophy among the southern Slavs known as the "spirit of Kosovo." The plain of Kosovo, "plain of the black-birds," had been the scene of an epic battle in 1389, when the Serbs with some Croats and Slovenes fought to stop the Turkish invasion of Europe. They were beaten, and Serbdom was exterminated. The national poetry (*Pigjesma*) sung in Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Dalmatia, and Montenegro conveyed through the

centuries this way of life, this "spirit of Kossovo." Unlike the Nazi *Weltanschauung*, "Kossovo" is not a form of national suicide, but a sacrifice by a nation for its resurrection through resistance and death.

All the South Slavs accepted this philosophy and applied it to their different historical positions. In Croatia, for instance, the struggle was, as in western Europe, on a political and social plan. Matija Gubets, the Croatian peasant who led a sixteenth-century revolution against the landowners, is an exciting precursor of the Partisan resistance in World War II. Dalmatia's intellectual independence of Venice and her great Croatian literature are miracles of national individuality.

Throughout the Turkish domination, two small sections of the Yugoslav lands retained their independence: Montenegro, which, cut off in its barren mountains, kept up a continual struggle and developed a tradition of heroism, and the Republic of Dubrovnik (Ragusa) which became rich through its trade and was the center of a flourishing Yugoslav art and literature. Montenegro remained independent until it merged with Yugoslavia by popular plebiscite in 1919. Dubrovnik lost its freedom in 1804, when it was taken by Napoleon's Marshal Marmont.

Rays of Freedom. The nationalistic consciousness of the Serbs, who were less advanced than the Croats, was preserved through the centuries with the folk songs, *pesme*, recited in oral tradition to the accompaniment of the one-stringed fiddle, the *gusla*. These songs glorified the memories of famous forebears and the struggle against the Turks, the legendary hero Prince Marko, and the many common men—the Haiduks (Robin Hoods and guerrillas)—who went on fighting the "terrible Turk" in the mountains. By the end of the eighteenth century many village notables (*Knez*) began to come into contact with foreign lands, and they led an uprising against the hard oppression by the Janissaries in 1804. This was the start of the movement for Serbian independence and eventually for southern Slav unification. The result was the first Serbian autonomous state, which lasted for nine years under George Petrovic, better known as Kara-George (Black George, 1766-1817). But the center of Serb cultural life was in Hungary and Vienna.³

After two resurrections, the little Principality of Serbia was

³ Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism*, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944), p. 549.

formed. Unable to expand northward into the rich plains inhabited by the Croats and Slovenes under Austrian rule, it continued its expansion southward at the expense of the Turks. The Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 established the southern frontier much as it was after 1918.

During the Magyar rebellion against Austria in 1848, the Magyar leaders refused the Yugoslav peoples those rights for which they themselves were fighting. The idea of Yugoslav unity then received a great impetus. When, at the end of the Great War, the King of Serbia was offered the crown of a unified Yugoslavia, both political memories and long years of literary efforts had familiarized all the Yugoslav peoples with this ideal.

World War I. During World War I, Austria occupied Serbia and Montenegro, as well as the Austrian provinces of Slovenia, Croatia, Voivodina, Dalmatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina. Each of these countries had a different history and made a different sort of a history during the war. Slovenians and Croats fought in the Austrian army, not against the Serbs, not well against the Russians, but excellently against Italians (especially when Austria published the London Secret Treaty). The opposition to Austria's rule came from the loyal parliamentary group (which joined the Czechs) and from the Yugoslav Committee in London, whose mission was not well received in France and England. In the meantime, opposition against Francis Joseph's monarchy grew, and Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes formed their legions in the Russian Army. The exiled Serbs in Corfu (and later in Salonica) under Pashitch worked for a "greater Serbia." The pact signed at Corfu in July, 1918, called for the creation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians, under the Serb dynasty of Karageorgevitch.

At the end of the war, the independence movement gathered ground; on October 6, 1918, the National Convention assembled in Agram (Zagreb) with the delegates from Slovenia (Koroshetz), Croatia (Pavelitch), and Serbia (that is, Austrian Serbia, represented by Pribichevitch). After the Bulgarian front collapsed, Prince Regent Alexander entered Belgrade with the Serbian Army. On October 28-29, Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence and proclaimed their union with Serbia, to be followed later by Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbia occupied the Voivodina (Subotica), Bosnia (Sarajevo), and Herzegovina (Mostar) and was joined on November 19 by Montenegro.

While discussions went on between Zagreb, Belgrade, and Geneva, the Italians began to occupy the lands promised to them under the London Secret Treaty. This occupation induced the Croats to join the Yugoslav Union, and on December 1, 1918, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was formed under the Karageorgevitch dynasty.⁴

CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The constitutional history of Serbia, which already had its own Parliament in the Middle Ages, is colorful; the same is true of all the provinces acquired from Austria-Hungary and Montenegro.⁵

The Vidovdan Constitution of 1921⁶ was based on the assumption that the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were one people differing in name, religion, and alphabet, and also, so far as the Slovenes were concerned, in language. The Constitution created one unicameral Parliament, whose legislative competence covered the whole country in all matters. The Kingdom was a monarchy under the rule of the national dynasty of Karageorgevitch of the former Kingdom of Serbia; King Peter I took the throne, but his health was bad, and his son Alexander was appointed regent. On his father's death on June 17, 1921, Alexander succeeded to the throne as King Alexander I.

⁴ When Serbia freed herself from the Turks, the Karageorgevitch and Obrenovitch houses alternated on the throne until 1893, when 19 revolver bullets and five saber cuts ended the career of Alexander Obrenovitch. B. Hardin's *Royal Purple*. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1935) is a forceful story of this period. Peter Karageorgevitch, who returned from exile, became King and established the present line of Yugoslavia's Kings.

⁵ Joseph Deopech and Julien Laferriere (F. R. & P. Dareste), *Les Constitutions modernes* (Paris: Sirey, 1929), Vol. II, pp. 431-433; Herbert F. Wright, *The Constitutions of the States at War 1914-1918* (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919), p. 553; W. M. Gewehir, *The Rise of Nationalism in the Balkans 1800-1930* (New York: Henry Holt, 1931), pp. 41-48; K. Lamp, "Die Verfassung von Bosnien und der Herzegovina vom 17. Februar 1910," *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart* 1910, V (Tubingen, 1911), pp. 137 and 229.

⁶ N. Jovanovich, "The Yugoslav Constitution," *The Slavonic Review*, III (1924-1925), pp. 166-178; M. W. Graham, *New Governments of Central Europe* (New York: Henry Holt, 1926), p. 382 ff.; Charles A. Beard and G. Radin, *The Balkan Pivot, Yugoslavia* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), p. 30 ff.; H. Lee McBain and Lindsay Rogers, *The New Constitutions of Europe* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1922), pp. 343-378; Arnold J. Zurcher, *The Experiment with Democracy in Central Europe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1933), *passim*.

The events leading to dictatorship of the King, the suspension of the Constitution, and the proclamation of a new Constitution will be described later. This document of September 3, 1931, differed from the previous constitution by an innovation on the domain of national representation: the introduction of a two-house system.⁷ It provided ironclad provisions for the unlimited power of the king, especially in the provisions concerning the appointment of the senators, the responsibility of the ministers, and the exceptional measures that the king might take. But, on the other hand, in contrast to the other Balkan constitutions, it made no pretense of using ultra-democratic phraseology and guarantees which were then violated so easily in practice. Political, regional, and religious associations were outlawed, even though their aim was merely physical education. All the male inhabitants over 21 years of age were given the right to vote; all the electors over 30 years of age had the right of presenting themselves for election. Deputies were elected for a period of four years.

The electoral law provided that all candidates for election to Parliament had to attach themselves to a national list with representatives in each single electoral division. The party securing the largest vote in the whole Kingdom was to receive two-thirds of the seats in the Chamber of Deputies. Thus, the elections of December 11, 1938, returned 306 deputies of the so-called Stoyadinovitch list (government party) and 67 of the Matchek list (the opposition).

The *banovina* councils were placed under the authority of the *ban*, the highest administrative official in the *banat*, appointed directly from Belgrade. The *banovina* councils were elected for four years on the basis of the parliamentary suffrage. *Banovina* ordinances were promulgated by the *ban*, who had first to secure the approval of the council of state. The *banovinas* were divided into 343 administrative districts, and these, in turn were subdivided into 3,855 communes; 36 municipalities enjoyed special status. Tito changed all this completely in 1945-1946, as pointed out later.

⁷ J. Deopech and Laferriere, *op. cit.*, III (1931), pp. 255-367; D. P. S. Taylor, ed., *Handbook of Central and East Europe* (Zurich: Central European Times, 1932), pp. 672-688; Emil Lengyel, "Yugoslavia's Sham Constitution," *The Nation*, CII (November 4, 1931), pp. 499-500; Dinko Tomasic, "Constitutional Changes in Yugoslavia," *Political Science Quarterly*, XXXX (December, 1940), pp. 582-593.

THE INTERNAL SQUABBLES

The nucleus of all political problems of Yugoslavia from the beginning of the formation of the new State to the present has been the problem of centralism. This issue divided the Serbs (first led by Nicholas Pashitch's Radical party), who wanted "Greater Serbia" realized, and the proponents of some form of regionalism and federalism, headed by the Croat Peasant party of Dr. Matchek and the late Stephen Raditch. Adamic thinks that the Serbian conception of a centralized state was imposed upon the State by Belgrade's two hundred families, the *charshya*.

The conflicts arose primarily from the fact that the Serbs, the largest racial group, were largely in control of the government and aimed to make the new state into a Greater Serbia. The Croats and the other group naturally resented this attempt at domination. The Serbs kept the Croats and the Slovenes and other racial groups in a position of inferiority. There were frequent disturbances inside Yugoslavia, assassinations were not uncommon, and the entire country seethed with unrest. King Alexander was assassinated by members of a terrorist anti-Serb organization of Macedonians and Croats while making a state visit to France in 1934.

Yugoslavia never had a Cavour. The Serbian Pashitches and Jovanovitches were merely Giolittis. Some unrecognized Mazzinis like Raditch and Pribichevitch either were killed or died in exile. Unification was, furthermore, handicapped by the policies of Germany and Italy and their satellites, Bulgaria and Hungary, which did not want a strong Yugoslavia.

THE ABYSS BETWEEN THE PEASANTRY AND THE INTELLIGENTSIA

The situation was further complicated by the abyss separating the peasant from the ruling clique. The peasantry, in addition to being the most conservative element of the nation, is nearly self-sufficient. Even the material for the peasant's clothing is still, in major parts, homemade. This fact, of course, helps him to weather depressions. In Croatia-Slavonia and the Voivodina, a number of large estates have been subdivided by the agrarian reform; here the standard of living is much higher and in Slovenia, par-

ticularly, it compares favorably with that of western Europe. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the reform also broke up the estates of the "Begis," the Turkish peasants still observe Turkish habits and have standards no higher than in Turkey and other countries of the Near East.

The Yugoslav peasants, especially those of prewar Serbia, are essentially political creatures, although trained only in the village politics and without much influence on the course of political decisions. Politics are discussed daily over innumerable cups of Turkish coffee in the *kafana*, or coffee-houses, the gathering place for the people of the agricultural communities.

A small cluster of urban elements, made up of the members of various professions, the more prosperous merchants, government officials, and politicians, have lost the qualities of their peasant ancestors and have acquired very few of the moral forces of the western bourgeoisie. But Yugoslavia's intelligentsia, having suffered from a severe economic depression and maldistribution of its educated classes, still hopes that the solution of its problems can be found in political strife. They give the cities more than their share of "coffee-house politics." Their limited horizon in social and national problems could hardly achieve a form positive in outlook and all-embracing in depth and width. In politics, the lawyer, the professional politician, the official, or the government almost entirely monopolizes the political stage. Nearly one-half of the entire membership of the Parliament of 1927, for instance, was composed of this social group; peasants and agricultural laborers possessed only about one-tenth of the mandates, although eighty per cent of Yugoslavia's population lives by agriculture.

PARLIAMENTARY DECAY

The first thrills of attainment over, the country faced serious international and internal problems—the technical aspect of administration, the peculiarities in law and administration of different provinces handed down from the previous regimes, and economic difficulties created by World War I and the resulting frontier changes. But instead of the politicians uniting their efforts toward the consolidation of the new State, petty politics soon dominated the Constituent Assembly. The parties were essentially a continuation of the old parties, resting on regional

orientation instead of on a program that would deal with the national questions. Consequently, the governmental coalitions never lasted very long and were never composed of the representatives from all districts of the Kingdom.

The parliamentary life of the first decade of state existence was nothing but a succession of crises, with changes of cabinet averaging nearly three a year. During the ten years of the Parliamentary regime, in fact, Yugoslavia changed 20 ministries, 24 governments, and 130 ministers. Ten cabinets lasted only a couple of months each; only two succeeded in remaining in office for eleven months. Some governments were in office for only one month, and some for only two weeks. Twenty ministers appeared in from three to five different ministries, and some headed six different ministerial departments. Very seldom did the various cabinets resign because of any fundamental difference of opinion regarding public policy. The fundamental task of the Parliament to enact constructive legislation was almost wholly neglected for political friction and disturbances which increased from year to year. Although Parliament had been returned three times by new elections—1923, 1925, 1927—during the whole period of its work it did not succeed in giving the country a uniform legislation, and the different laws which had been operative in the various provinces before the union were still in force when the dictatorship tried to cut the Gordian knot. Division, nepotism, and inefficiency ruled supreme. Membership in a party or in a government was considered valuable more from the viewpoint of personal revenue and advantages than of a call to serve the interests of the new nation.

The limited horizon of the pre-World War I politicians was conducive to their using the same mentality for the entirely new problems of the Kingdom. The cabinet constellations were governed by illogical inconsistencies, going from one extreme to another. Raditch, for instance, went from jail into the position of a cabinet minister, only to break his oath and again attack the government in a few months. In general, the struggle of personalities lacked social *raison d'être*. The differences between the Serbs and Croats, the fundamental issue of Yugoslav politics, really defied solution, owing in part to the intransigency of the Serbs and in part to the bad and short-sighted policy of Raditch. Additional bitterness was created by the extension of the bureaucratic system of Belgrade to the rest of the new Kingdom. This excessive cen-

tralization was not adapted to the regional requirements of administrative autonomy. Intrigue became endemic, and personal jealousies allowed a great degree of treachery. Newspapers printed reckless, slanderous, vitriolic statements about men in public affairs. Most of the dailies were provincial in character and reflected local interests only. The elections were under great official pressure and corruption, and gerrymandering was a common electoral practice.

THE STATE CRISIS

The conflicts between a policy of Yugoslav centralism and the practical allegiance of the old parties to regional tendencies produced a crisis of state on June 20, 1928. A supporter of the government killed and wounded several members of the Croat Peasant party. Raditch died from his wounds. His followers withdrew from Belgrade and set up their own parliament at Zagreb, where they passed resolution refusing to recognize the "rump" Parliament at Belgrade. When the tenth anniversary of the founding of the state was celebrated on December 1, the Croats refused to participate. Quite obviously, the only way out of this political *impasse* was the one offered by the King—the dictatorship.

ALEXANDER—THE "UNIFIER"

Born at Cetinje (Montenegro) in 1888, as the fourth child of Prince Peter, Alexander was educated at the court of the last Russian Tsar, Nicholas II. He studied at the military academy at Petrograd and later in Geneva, where his father lived in exile. When the boy was fifteen years of age, his father ascended the throne of Serbia following the murder of Alexander Obrenovitch in 1903. His brother George was the heir, since by rules of seniority he should have been King of Yugoslavia. But once, in a fit of passion, George thrashed his valet to death, and Alexander took the succession in March, 1909. He entered the Army and served there continually until called in 1914 to become regent on account of his father's illness. He was at the head of the army in World War I when it was beaten back through Albania to the Adriatic. Those days endeared Alexander to his people. In 1921, young Alexander became the Second King of the Serb-Croat-

Slovene State. While Greece, Romania, and Bulgaria have imported their kings from the foreign royal houses of Europe, Alexander had the distinction, like the King of Albania, of coming from a truly native dynasty.

He took over the leadership of his state at the age of twenty-six. It is not surprising, therefore, that the military mentality always remained with him. In his new State he found no great outstanding statesmen, but only a number of gifted men and even more numerous petty politicians. The first decade of his country's existence certainly could not make him happy. But he displayed unusual patience and regard for constitutional niceties, and seldom interfered in politics before the dictatorship was proclaimed. However, when tribal hatreds were shaking the very foundation of the state, Alexander decided to act. Without warning, during the night of January 5-6, 1929, with one stroke, he swept the muddled political pawns from the Yugoslav political chessboard. "Parliamentary government," said he in his proclamation, "which was always my own ideal as it was that of my unforgettable father, has been so abused by blind party passions that it prevented every useful development in the State. It is my sacred duty to preserve the unity of the State by every means within my power. I have, therefore, decided hereby to decree the Constitution of the Kingdom of 1921 abolished. The laws of the land will remain in force unless cancelled by my royal decree. New laws in the future will be made by the same method."

General Pera Zhivkovitch (one of the conspirators who murdered King Alexander and Queen Draga in 1903), was appointed to head the government and began to govern the country by decree. Public assemblage was prohibited and a drastic press law enforced. On January 19, a decree reorganizing and unifying the judicial system was put into force. A single penal code for the entire Kingdom, modeled upon those in effect in Hungary and Italy, was established. All parties were dissolved. The municipal bodies went by the board in February, and in April the number of ministries was reduced from 17 to 12, and superfluous employees dismissed. Croat newspapers, tolerated at first, were gradually suppressed, and army officers suspected of being hostile to the dictatorship were retired. One of the most important steps was taken on October 3, 1929, when the title "Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes" was supplemented by "the Kingdom of Yugoslavia"; at the same time, the historic frontiers of the

provinces were abolished, being replaced by nine *banats*, designed to submerge completely the individualities of the old administrative units and to cut across the former regional boundaries. A strictly nationalistic system of education replaced the former confessional schools.⁸

THE PATH OF DICTATORSHIP

But the initial dynamic activity of the authoritarian regime slowed down. Since the elections of November 8, 1931, allowed only candidacies of Zhivkovitch's party, the government "won." But matters were not going well, and the creeping economic and financial crisis, coupled with a slow-down in the regime's constructive achievements, gave ammunition to the opposition. Even the Serbs began to oppose the system, and the Croats began to cooperate with the Fascist *Ustashis*; the IMRO terrorists were again busy in Macedonia. In 1934, while en route to Paris, Alexander was assassinated in Marseille by the right-hand gunman of Mihaloff, the Macedonian master killer. His accomplices were Croat terrorists trained in Hungary. Their leaders, Dr. Ante Pavelitch (who was to return as Hitler's quisling of Croatia) and Gustav Pertschetz, sought shelter in Italy, where another group of Croat extremists, the *Ustashis*, had been trained for their anti-government exploits in Yugoslavia.

Alexander's place was taken by Prince Paul, a half-Russian and a member of the regency that ruled during Peter II's minority. Paul permitted a certain amount of opposition that rallied under Dr. Matchek, successor to Raditch in the leadership of the Croats. Yevtitch (who was to turn up in the government in exile) became his Premier. In 1935 Dr. Stoyadinovitch, who led his country into the camp of Germany, took Yevtitch's place; but his pro-German policy was unpopular—a fact that became evident in the election of December 11, 1938, when 41 per cent of the votes were cast for the opposition and only 59 per cent for the government.

The Serbo-Croat agreement (*sporazum*) of 1939, concluded between the Croat leaders and the Crown as the representative of Serbia, was the first concession to the Croatian people after twenty years of struggle. A step toward federalism, it came too late, al-

⁸ H. F. Armstrong, "The Kingdom of Yugoslavia," *Foreign Affairs*, VII (January, 1930), pp. 297-300; M. W. Graham, "The Dictatorship in Yugoslavia," *American Political Science Review*, XXIII (1929), pp. 449-450.

though the indomitable Croatian Peasant party leader, Dr. Vladimir Matchek, in the very moment of danger from Germany, decided to cooperate with Belgrade and so reinforce Yugoslavia.

THE NAZI INTERLUDE

The story of how Yugoslavia resisted the Nazi maneuvers and eventually started a national revolution against the government that wanted to use "appeasement" tactics is one of the heroic tales of World War II.⁹ Negotiations for Yugoslavia's adherence to the Rome-Berlin-Tokio alliance were nearly concluded under Prince Paul's pressure. But at one o'clock on March 27, 1941, while Belgrade slept, tanks, trucks, and artillery units moved swiftly to strategic points throughout the capital. The Regent and the Cvetkovitch Government were overthrown and taken into custody. Seventeen-year-old King Peter II assumed full powers, with General Dushan Simovitch, popular lady's man and veteran of the heroic Serbian Army of World War I, as the Premier; Matchek agreed to become Vice-Premier. But at 5:15 A.M. on Sunday, April 6, 1941, the full fury of the German *Blitzkrieg* struck at Yugoslavia.¹⁰ In a few days, the Yugoslav Army, defeated by the Nazi hordes, was divided by Simovitch into guerrilla parties—the kind of fighting carried on by the Serbian *Commatajis* for centuries against the Turkish and Habsburg rulers. The twelve days of *Blitzkrieg* resulted in the partition of the country. Serbia and the Banat fell under German military rule, and on August 29, a puppet government under General Milan Neditch was set up there. On May 3, 1941, Italy annexed the greater part of Slovenia as the Province of Ljubljana. On July 12, 1941, a "Constituent Assembly" at Cetinje proclaimed an independent Montenegro under Italian protection. On April 10, 1941, the independence of Croatia was proclaimed, and eight days later the first government of Dr. Ante Pavelitch as *Poglavnik* (Leader) and Prime Minister appeared. The Duke of Spoleto, a nephew of

⁹ For more details, see Joseph S. Roucek, "Hitler over the Balkans," *World Affairs Interpreter*, XII (July, 1941), pp. 136-152; Nicholas Mirkowich, "Yugoslavia's Choice," *Foreign Affairs*, XX (October, 1941), pp. 131-151; Robert John, *From the Land of the Silent People* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1942); and Leigh White, *The Long Balkan Night* (New York: Scribner's, 1944).

¹⁰ For details, see Paul W. Thompson, *Modern Battle* (New York: Penguin Books, 1942), Chapter 7, "War for the Passes," pp. 122-165.

the King of Italy, was proclaimed King of Croatia on May 18 as King Tomislav I, but he never assumed the throne. By the treaty of May 18, Italy also took possession of the Dalmatian Coast and most of the Adriatic islands. The Hungarians now seized the northern section of Yugoslavia known as the Voivodina and the Bulgarians occupied south Serbia (Macedonia). The Germans incorporated certain border regions into the Third Reich. King Peter's government went into exile in London.

INTERNAL DISSENSIONS AND GUERRILLA WARFARE

When Hitler invaded Yugoslavia he was greatly aided by the internal dissensions. Certain elements which had long been opposed to the domination of the Serbs lent him considerable assistance. On the eve of the invasion, in fact, the country was so divided on the issue of yielding without resistance that it took an internal upheaval resulting in the overthrow of the government to effect resistance. Thus, while Hitler would undoubtedly have subdued Yugoslavia even if the country had been united, there can be no question but that his task was rendered much less difficult by the widespread internal strife.

After Yugoslavia surrendered, the Germans fanned racial hatreds between the Serbs and Croats, producing a condition of virtual civil war. No less than 300,000 murders, perhaps even more, took place within the boundaries of Yugoslavia following the spring of 1941.

To a certain extent, the ensuing difficulties were but a continuation of the old feuds and racial differences. During the early period following the surrender, all resistance to the Axis appeared to be centered in a group known as the Chetniks, led by Draja Mikhailovitch, then a colonel in the Yugoslav Army. The Chetniks took whatever arms they could gather and fled to the mountains, whence they organized guerrilla resistance to the invaders. To the outside world, the Chetniks typified the highest form of heroism, and Mikhailovitch became the symbol of resistance to tyranny. The Chetniks received the blessing of the United States and England, and Mikhailovitch was made Minister of War in the cabinet of the government in exile located in London. At the same time, he was elevated to the rank of general.

So long as the Chetniks constituted the only organized groups effectively fighting the Axis in Yugoslavia, few problems arose, and the logical policy of the Allies was to support this group. But reports soon began to seep out of Yugoslavia of another effective group of guerrilla fighters, known as the Partisans, who were also fighting the Axis. Led by a mysterious figure, Josip Broz, with the nickname "Tito," the Partisans came into greater and greater prominence. Not only did they engage the conquerors in battle, but, like the Chetniks, they committed acts of sabotage, destroying railroads and bridges and generally harassing the Germans and Italians. It is estimated that Germany had to keep as many as 20 divisions in Yugoslavia to keep the country from boiling over.

For a time, it is reported, the forces of General Mikhailovitch and those of Tito agreed upon a program of collaboration in fighting the Axis, but their period of cooperation was short-lived. Before long, all the ancient feuds burst into flame, and the two groups were frequently engaged in fighting each other instead of fighting the enemy. The Partisans accused the Chetniks of supporting the prewar cause of a Greater Serbia and of reorganizing the country at the expense of the other racial groups. On numerous occasions, the Chetniks have been charged with actually aiding the enemy. That was the reason given for the execution of a number of Mikhailovitch followers.

The Chetniks, on their part, accused the Partisans of trying to weaken the country by fomenting dissension and starting civil war. They said that the Partisans were nothing but communist rabble and bandits, trying to remake the country on communist lines. The Chetniks claimed to have the undivided support of England and the United States, in view of the fact that those countries supported the Yugoslav government in exile in which their leader Mikhailovitch held the War portfolio. On the other hand, the Partisans claimed to have the support of the Soviet Union. Thus, the issue became international in scope and threatened to divide the major allies.

TITO AND KING PETER

At the beginning of 1944, Yugoslavia was caught in an ideological triangle—Tito, Matchek, and Mikhailovitch—in which the

Serbs and Croats were fighting out their old grudges. The Serbs, moreover, were divided by an ideological fight that caused their left wing to side with the Croats in the Partisan forces. King Peter's government was completely unable to end the fratricidal strife, and Russia had already taken a hand. In Tiflis, Stalin's old home town, a "Free Yugoslavia" radio station was set up and from it the news about Tito's Partisans was broadcast to the world. Britain's liaison officer convinced Downing Street that its warm smile for Peter's government and its cold shoulder toward Tito would have to be reversed. London was anxious to show Moscow that friends of the Soviet Union were automatically friends of Britain, and accordingly forced the elimination of Serbian nationalist officers surrounding young King Peter.

An agreement was reached between Marshal Tito and Dr. Subasitch, King Peter's man, on the formation of a united provisional government and for elections to a constituent assembly at the end of 1944, but the relations between Peter and Tito soon began to deteriorate. In fact, Peter was King of a new Yugoslavia that he had never known. Tito's government, which had never known him, had the upper hand. In 1944, the blacksmith's boy of Klenjev became Marshal and Provisional President of Yugoslavia. He got rid of Peter as King a year later.

YUGOSLAVIA UNDER TITO

Tito's regime has not escaped serious criticism. Most Yugoslavs heartily approved his movement's proclaimed democratic principles, but many, dismayed by the ruthlessness it displayed towards all opponents, had serious doubts whether these principles were actually being applied. Tito's men branded any form of opposition or criticism as "fascism" and harshly repressed it. The term was no longer connected with any particular form of political philosophy, but was anything that did not suit the new regime. The head of the Roman Catholic Church in Yugoslavia, Archbishop Stepinatz, was sentenced to 16 years in prison for anti-Tito activities.

The country was reorganized on a federal basis with six states (Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia), and one semi-autonomous area, the Voivodina. The new Constitution is almost identical with the Soviet Constitution

adopted in 1936. It provides for exactly the same governmental structure; of 139 articles, 77 are copied from the Russian Constitution without alteration. Article 74 of the Constitution, like Article 49 of the Soviet Constitution, concentrates power in the hands of the Presidium of the "parliament" (or Supreme Soviet). This effectively nullifies the powers of the bicameral legislature. The real power rests with the "Big Seven," all members of the Communist Party: Josip Broz, Edvard Kardelj, Moshe Pijade, Milovan Djilas, Sreten Zhujevitch, Aleksander Rankovitch and Andrij Hebrang. In addition to the "Big Seven," there is a whole army of communist first, second and third-class "guides." The first class includes the Prime Ministers of the six Federal Republics.

Local administration is maintained through the People's Council (*Vijece*), patterned on the Soviet model. The Communist Party's local, district or regional secretaries are usually the secretaries of the People's Councils. Each Council has its "denunciation" office, which issues a *karakteristika*, a secret report on every citizen within its territory.¹¹ There are, of course, the usual constitutional paper guarantees of freedom of speech, assembly, and religion; but a political terror has characterized Tito's regime. The Department for the Defense of the People, the *OZNA*, is patterned on the *NKVD*, the Soviet secret police. It is organized into several sections, for the control of the citizens, the army, residents abroad, foreigners and state employees and officials, including Communist Party members. It apparently has a paralleled chain of command independent of either the civil or military authorities and is responsible only to Marshal Tito, through its chief, Major General Alexander Rankovitch, an honest but fanatic veteran member of the Partisan movement.

On the more constructive side, in August, 1945, Tito announced that a monarchy was "incompatible with democracy in Yugoslavia," apparently ending any prospect for the restoration of Peter II, and granted a wide amnesty and reprieve for all those who were led by compulsion or confusion to work for the enemy during the German and Italian occupation. The separate Na-

¹¹ For more details on the operation of Tito's government, see: Bogdan Raditsa, "Yugoslavia Today," *New Republic*, CXV (September 9, 1946), pp. 284-287; "Proletarian Proconsul," *Time* (September 16, 1946), pp. 26-30; P. S., "The Yugoslav Political Situation," *The World Today*, II (January, 1946), pp. 13-27; A. N. Dragnich, "Yugoslavia's New Constitution," *Current History*, X (May, 1946), pp. 420-423.

tional Liberation fronts in the six federal states were welded into a united People's Front, modeled on the central Belgrade government's federative relationship to the autonomous governments of Yugoslavia's distinct nationalities. The new over-all party adopted a charter of principles infused with a spirit of unity among the Yugoslav peoples, and with a program of Balkan peace, democratic republicanism, and far-reaching social welfare.

AVNOJ—the Anti-Fascist Emergency Parliament—which developed out of the resistance committee in the early days of the occupation, made room for new deputies from groups outside the People's Front, and started to consider bills for agrarian reform, freedom of the courts, of the press, and of public meeting, and the mechanism for the election of a Constituent Assembly which was to write *AVNOJ* out of existence by devising a constitutional government.¹² The elections of November 11, 1945, were, as a matter of course, won by the Communist-run National Front which claimed 6,500,000 votes as against 700,000 for the opposition. However, the opposition parties had refused to put up candidates on the grounds that the election had been rigged and that the week before the balloting the single opposition paper in Belgrade had been suppressed.

RECENT TRENDS

During 1947, Tito continued strengthening his hold on the country, in spite of frequent and persistent criticism of Great Britain and the United States. He made claims for Slovene Carinthia and in March sent an urgent appeal to the United States for immediate food relief. But at the same time, Tito criticized the United States, claiming that, because of United States intervention, Greece had become a base for imperialistic plans which might threaten world peace; he denied that his country was a satellite of the U.S.S.R. In April, Tito published a Five-Year Plan for the industrialization and electrification of the country.

Foreign Affairs. Tito "wielded more personal power than any other man in Europe except Joseph Stalin, and, with the same exception, he was perhaps the world's most successful proletarian statesman," reported *Time* (September 16, 1946). He had the

¹² Hal Lehrman, "Progress in Yugoslavia," *The Nation*, CIXI (August 18, 1945), pp. 156-157.

power to have Mikhailovitch tried and executed as a war criminal—in spite of international protests. His army caused a major international incident when five American airmen flying over Yugoslavia's territory were shot down in August, 1946. This provoked an ultimatum from the United States.

At the same time, Tito was pushing relentlessly for the unification of the Balkans under his personal leadership. For centuries, the plains and mountains of southeastern Europe were furrowed by the human erosion of migrating peoples and shifting empires. Greeks, Macedonians, Romans, Huns, Goths, Turks, and Slavs contested the Balkan salient. Today it is once more contested in a struggle potentially as ferocious as and probably more important in its consequences to the world than any of the earlier ones. Russia (through Tito) is pressing on to federate all the Balkans under her tutelage, thus aiming to control the Dardanelles and the Mediterranean from the European side. Tito's fanatical allegiance to the cause of Soviet Russia reaches out all over the Balkans. He demanded Trieste, in spite of the opposition of the United States and Great Britain. His iron grasp also reached out across the troubled border of Greek Macedonia, a wild, rocky land which no one would covet were it not for its strategic position on the Aegean Sea.¹³ Greek Macedonians, supported by Greek communists and Yugoslav agents, together with those from Bulgaria and Albania, constantly seeping across the border, were noisily agitating to join Yugoslavian Macedonians in an "autonomous" Yugoslav-sponsored state. The prongs reached across other frontiers, into Bulgaria and Albania, offering and demanding friendship. Defeated Bulgaria, a Slavic state now hoping to find a solution for its defeat in its cry of Pan-Slavism, reached out across the frontier into Greece for Thrace (right next to Macedonia). Albania, a satellite's satellite, was quarrelling with Greece over northern Epirus. To the north Tito reached across the Austrian border to claim a large slice of Carinthia, including Kalgenfurt. At the same time, he violently fought internationalization of the Danube.

These aims and pressures outlined Tito's—and thus also Russia's—ultimate Balkan objective: a communist federation including Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and as much of Greece as could be torn from the government's control at Athens.

¹³ See: Joseph S. Roucek, "The Eternal Problem of Macedonia," *International Journal*, II (Autumn, 1947), pp. 297-307.

They believed that the federation's bulk would eventually swallow all of Greece, engulf the Dardanelles for Russia, threaten Turkey, and poise menacingly over the whole Middle East and the Mediterranean.

Within the framework of this master-plan, Tito worked diligently for its goals during 1946-1947. On December 29, 1946, Yugoslavia and Albania signed a treaty which set up a "common tariff and customs territory"; the document was implemented on August 2, 1947, by the agreement with Bulgaria, leading to a customs union, the extension of rail and road communication, cultural and press cooperation, and the renunciation by Yugoslavia of the \$25,000,000 still outstanding on reparations account. Under a subsequent agreement signed in Sofia on August 25, Yugoslav-Bulgar trade was to be raised to a rate of a thousand million leva annually; and on November 29, 1947, returning from Sofia, Tito announced the signing of a new twenty-year pact with Bulgaria. "Although we did not sign a treaty of federation," said Tito, "we will act as though we signed one."

In September, 1947, Tito revealed, before the People's Front Congress which includes delegates from Communist parties all over Europe, the latest international tactics: a revival and stiffening of the People's Front strategy—that is, Communists posturing as the great friend of democracy in league with any deluded non-communist group. Tito called for the unity of "progressive" forces "throughout the world" against "international reaction headed by American financial magnates (which is) . . . reviving fascism in various countries, including western Germany." In June, 1947, Tito refused permission to the Balkan subcommittee of inquiry to enter Yugoslav territory to investigate frontier incidents with Greece; next month the government withdrew from the International Labor Organization and declined the invitation to the Paris conference to consider the so-called Marshall Plan. Tito's representatives also participated in the newly created Cominform which declared a political war to a finish against United States "imperialism"; Belgrade was eventually designated as its headquarters.¹⁴ In November, 1947, Stanoje Smitch, Yugo-

¹⁴ "The Belgrade International" describes the organization which nine communist parties of central-eastern Europe created at a secret conference in Poland at the end of September, 1947. The name comes from the fact that the new Communist Bureau of Information was designated to have its headquarters in the Yugoslav capital. The meeting was under the aegis of two members of the Soviet Politburo, Andrei A. Zhdanov and Georgie M. Malenkov, and participated in by the delegates of the

slav Foreign Minister, asked Secretary of State Marshall to release \$56,000,000 of Yugoslav gold frozen in America during World War II. But the United States-Yugoslav relations were steadily deteriorating—while Tito continued his “pan-movement” to unify the Balkans, and signed a twenty-year mutual aid treaty with Hungary on December 8, 1947.¹⁵

All in all, at the turn of 1948, Tito's regime was well entrenched and getting considerable favors from the U.S.S.R. as the main spearhead of its drive toward world communism in central-eastern Europe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMIC, LOUIS, *My Native Land* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943); *The Native's Return* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1934). Very readable, although often unreliable, naive, and violently pro-Soviet in the first volume. The same thesis is propounded again in “Yugoslavia and the Big United Nations,” *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXII (May, 1944), pp. 1-15.
- BAERLEIN, HENRY P. B., *The Birth of Yugoslavia* (London: Parsons, 1922). Extensive, sympathetic treatment.
- BEARD, CHARLES A., and RADIN, GEORGE, *The Balkan Pivot: Yugoslavia* (New York: Macmillan, 1929). On the post-World War I politics of Yugoslavia.
- GRAHAM, STEPHEN, *Alexander of Yugoslavia* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1939). A very readable introduction to the history of the House of Karageorgevitch.
- LAFFAN, R. G. D., *Yugoslavia Since 1918* (London: Yugoslav Society, 1929). An excellent brief summary.
- LONCAR, DRAGOTIN, *The Slovenes* (Cleveland: American Yugoslav Printing & Publishing Co., 1939). On the social history of the country.

Communist parties from France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Poland. The conference agreed to establish an information bureau at Belgrade consisting of two representatives of each member party, which is to publish a fortnightly organ in French and Russian. Above all, it was to “exchange experiences and, in case of necessity, coordinate the activity” of the nine parties.

¹⁵ But Moscow cooled off to a considerable degree to the whole idea of a Balkan federation at the turn of January, 1948, after Premier Dimitrov of Bulgaria signed a treaty of alliance between Bulgaria and Rumania in January, 1948. During this period, Moscow inaugurated a new conciliatory attitude toward the West and had, obviously, decided that it would be much harder to deal with a Balkan confederation than with the present separate and mutually jealous states.

- MARKHAM, R. H., *Tito's Imperial Communism* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1947). An able and penetrating condemnation of Tito's tactics.
- MARTIN, DAVID, *Ally Betrayed* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946). An early gun in the battle of the books that has opened over the truth behind World War II propaganda. It dispels the fog of biased propaganda which enveloped Yugoslavia during the fratricidal struggle between Tito, backed by Stalin, and Mikhailovitch, who was first encouraged and then betrayed by Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt.
- MITCHELL, RUTH, *The Serbs Choose War* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1943). The grim, heroic work of the Yugoslav guerrillas, as seen by General Billy Mitchell's sister; pro-Serb and pro-Mikhailovitch.
- PETROVICH, M. B., "The Central Government of Yugoslavia," *Political Science Quarterly*, LXII (December, 1947), pp. 504-530. A scholarly and a detailed survey of definite usefulness.
- ROUCEK, JOSEPH S., *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939), "Yugoslavia," Chapter IV, pp. 55-83; *Central-Eastern Europe* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946), Chapters IX, pp. 199-204, and XXIII, pp. 506-519.
- ST. JOHN, ROBERT, *The Silent People Speak* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1948). A propaganda tract; St. John is more optimistic about Tito's regime than Tito himself.
- WEST, REBECCA, *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon* (New York: Viking Press, 1941, 2 vols.). A lengthy discourse on nearly all aspects of Yugoslavia's history; classic.

BULGARIA

GEOPOLITICAL SITUATION

Bulgaria is situated at the gateway between southeastern Europe and Asia Minor, within several hours' journey by rail from Constantinople. Its strategic position is suggested by the numerous battles fought on Bulgarian soil by conquerors of bygone days. But Bulgaria's location is also a handicap, as it borders on the turbulent waters of the Black Sea, not on the Aegean.

The transverse Balkan Mountains, from which the Balkan Peninsula takes its name, extend from west to east through Bulgaria and divide the main agricultural area into two parts. In fact Bulgaria is more mountainous than Romania. Genuine plains occupy a little less than a third of the entire area, while about 38 per cent of the total area is arable land. The great contrasts in temperature have resulted in the development of a variety of cultures. Though Bulgaria is rich in mineral deposits, with the exception of coal (chiefly lignite) and copper, these resources are exploited in a small way if at all. Industry is but little developed and is mainly engaged in the manufacture of agricultural products. Transportation and communications are still very inadequate, in spite of the active construction policy pursued during the past few years. The Danube and the Maritza Rivers are the only internal waterways of any importance. The international trade of Bulgaria necessarily consists of the exchange of agricultural products for cheap manufactured goods.

Economics. Agriculture has been the main occupation of the Bulgarian people from the very beginning of their nation's history some 16 or 17 centuries ago, when the first Slavonic tribes settled in the region. The livelihood of over 80 per cent of the inhabitants, who total nearly seven million, is dependent upon the land.¹ But agriculture is still in a backward state. Primitive

¹ Joseph S. Roucek, "Economic Geography of Bulgaria," *Economic Geography*, XI (July, 1935), pp. 307-323.

methods of cultivation, ignorance of scientific appliances, lack of capital, and excessive subdivision of the land are the major causes of stagnation. There are no large estates, Stambuliski having proclaimed the abolition of large land holdings in 1921. Altogether, 45 per cent of the peasant holdings are of less than 10 acres. Of the total number of farmers, 80 per cent farm their own land. This is explained by the inheritance laws of Bulgaria, which provide for the distribution of the real estate among the children. But the population has increased faster than the arable land; and there is a wide gap between the standard of living of the village peasant and that of the urban dweller.

Social Conditions. During the two decades after World War I, Bulgaria waged three unsuccessful wars, lost tens of thousands of workers on the battlefields, spent a large part of her wealth for war, was compelled to support invalids, widows, and orphans, ceded territories to neighbors, and was forced by treaties to pay reparations and indemnities. The situation was always worse than bad, and before Hitler's hordes took over the country in 1941 it became even worse than ever. There was hardly any money, although there was plenty of cheap food.

To the internal difficulties were added serious international troubles. Surrounded by hostile neighbors always suspicious of Bulgaria's irreconcilability to her defeats, Bulgaria in the years following World War I had to face a series of frontier incidents and frequent threats by her former opponents. The disturbed social conditions were reflected in the social structure of the Kingdom. While the largest cities (and there were only a few of them) had many of the conveniences found in western Europe, the peasant eked from his toil only the barest necessities of life. He could not afford to sell or exchange his farm produce for other needed articles. To a considerable extent each peasant household was a self-contained economic and social unit. The peasant standard of living and purchasing power remained abysmally low, and the high cost of manufactured articles forced him to live in a primitive way and almost entirely on the produce of his land. Additional troubles came with the invasion of the country by hundreds of thousands of refugees from Macedonia, Thrace, and Dobrudja.

In spite of wars and internal social and economic unrest, the population of Bulgaria has grown steadily. Since Bulgaria became independent, it has more than doubled its population: in density,

it may be compared to the State of Ohio. An eternal problem is presented by the ever-growing numbers of an "intellectual proletariat," composed of young men who, having received a secondary or university education, do not wish to work upon the land of their fathers, yet cannot find "white collar" jobs. Those who have "white collar" positions find their purchasing power very limited because of the low wages.

Yet of all the Balkan countries, Bulgaria is said to have made the greatest educational progress in the shortest length of time.² Illiteracy has been practically wiped out. Fully 90 per cent of Bulgarian youths can read and write, although in 1900, of the men married, 45 per cent were illiterate.

Minorities. The Bulgarians, like the Yugoslavs, belong to the Slav race. But we must qualify this point. Slavic tribes overran the ancient Thraco-Illyrian group in Bulgaria between the third and sixth centuries. In the latter part of the next century came the Bulgarians, a Ural-Altaic group from the Finnic group of the Sibiric branch of the Asian race; they were absorbed by the Slavs, giving their name to the group which absorbed them. Thereafter came Turks, Tartars, Circassians, and Gypsies. A certain amount of amalgamation took place, and today very few Bulgarians can claim to be of pure Bulgarian blood.

The Bulgarian language belongs to the great Indo-European language family, of which Sanskrit and its offshoots are the easternmost, and the Celtic languages the westernmost members. The immigrant groups of the sixth and seventh centuries used a novel and difficult Slav tongue, so that the Byzantine missionaries could not use Greek in trying to convert them. Cyril and Methodius, the two foremost missionaries, studied the Slavonic tongue in Macedonia and composed a new alphabet containing, it is true, many Greek letters but also many others especially invented to reproduce Slavonic phonetics. This alphabet, the so-called "Cyrillic," is used, with slight modifications to suit local requirements, by Russians, Serbians, and Bulgarians today. Cyril and Methodius translated the Scriptures into the current local Slavonic dialect. This Slavonic tongue is now called "Old Bulgarian," or "Church Slavonic." After the conquest of Bulgaria by Turkey, the Bulgarian language became more idiomatic and more exclusively the language of the peasant masses. This explains why it is the least

² W. F. Russell, *Schools in Bulgaria* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1924); R. H. Markham, *Meet Bulgaria* (Sofia: American Mission, 1931), pp. 184-206.

euphonious of the Slavonic tongues and why Bulgarian literature is the poorest of all Slavonic literatures.³

Religion. From a religious point of view, the population of Bulgaria is predominantly Greek-Orthodox. This faith has been given a national form, representing a protest against the domination of the Greek Patriarchate, which was felt to be an enemy of the national revival that began in the nineteenth century. The Constitution provides that the Greek Orthodox religion is the State religion. But members of other religions, including Jews and Moslems, enjoy full liberty of faith.

While the Greek Orthodox Bulgarians form 84 per cent of the whole population, the remaining 16 per cent are Mohammedans (Turks, Tartars, and Pomaks). About one-third of the Catholics (a total of less than 1 per cent) belong to the Uniate Church, and the rest adhere to the Latin Church. The Jews support over 21 synagogues (two of which are for German Jews).

Exchange of Minorities. The Greco-Bulgarian Convention concerning the reciprocal emigration of 1919 was a specific attempt to encourage the emigration of Greeks from Bulgaria and of Bulgarians from Greece.⁴ The Bulgarians forced to leave eastern Macedonia and Thrace descended upon the Greek villages in southern Bulgaria and compelled the Greeks to emigrate to Greece. Practically all the Greeks of Bulgaria had to transfer their residence. A few remaining Greeks, mostly in the cities, are intensely hated by the Bulgarians.

It is unnecessary to notice other minorities, since this problem is probably less serious in Bulgaria than in any of the Balkan states. The Bulgarians constitute an exceptionally homogeneous people. Before the occupation by the Nazis, Bulgaria's minorities policy was very tolerant. The equality of the Bulgarian subjects was provided for in Article 57 of the Constitution, and electoral law created no differences based on the nationality of the voters. Only the Gypsies had no electoral right. The minorities were granted a certain autonomy in school matters, although the state supervised the Moslem, Armenian, Jewish, and Greek schools, and the teaching of the Bulgarian language, history, and geography was compulsory.

³ Demetri Shishmanov, *A Survey of Bulgarian Literature* (Williamsport, Pa: The Bayard Press, 1932); *Le Mouvement Littéraire en Bulgarie* (Sofia: Imprimerie de la Cour, 1925, "La Bulgarie d'Aujourd'hui," #6); Markham, *op cit.*, pp. 207-224.

⁴ S. P. Lados, *The Exchange of Minorities* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932).

HISTORY

The history of Bulgaria parallels that of Serbia. Settled by the Slavs in the sixth century, the country was overrun by the Bulgars (akin to the Huns and Avars)—fierce and barbarous horsemen who had passed from Asia through Russia to the Danube plain. The adoption of the Slavonic (“Old Bulgarian”) language as that of the official liturgy was the final stage in the assimilation of the original Bulgarian race with the Slavonic tribes.⁵ A Bulgarian Empire was established in the ninth century under Simeon, who assumed the title of Tsar. This Empire extended over the whole of the Balkans. Bulgaria once more appeared as an imperial power under Asen II, who, with Tirnovo as his capital, ruled the entire Balkan peninsula. The second Bulgarian Empire fell to pieces in 1241. But the memory of these empires has ever since lingered in the breasts of the nationalistically-minded Bulgarians. The Turks invaded the entire valley of the Maritza and seized Sofia in 1382. The five centuries of Turkish rule (1396-1878) constitute a dark epoch in Bulgarian history.

Modern Bulgarian nationalism dates from the nineteenth century. In 1762 there arose from a monastery cell of Mount Athos the voice of Monk Paisy, reminding his people of their great past. His work marks the beginning of a literary revival in Bulgaria that culminated a century later in a revolt against the Phanariots’ spiritual oppression and soon afterward against the political tyranny of the Turks. Here we meet with the curious system utilized by the Turkish administration to govern its non-Turkish subjects. As the religion of all the conquered nationalities in Turkey was Greek Orthodox, the Turks recognized the Greek Patriarch as the representative of the subject races. The seat of the Greek Patriarchate in the Phanar quarter of Constantinople became the sole Orthodox Church in Turkey. The Greek clergy, utilizing this advantageous position, tried to impose everything Greek on the Bulgarians. The nationalistic revival in 1870 forced the formation of the Bulgarian Exarchate by Constantinople, freeing the country from the Greek Church. In the same year, Bulgaria’s nationalists organized a secret “Bulgarian Central Committee” in Bucharest, which resulted in a rebellion on April 18, 1876.

⁵ Christ Anastasoff, “Bulgaria’s National Struggles” (and the bibliography cited therein) in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXXI (March, 1944), pp. 101-106.

The suppression of this rebellion was called to Europe's attention by Gladstone, who led the general outcry for punishment of the "terrible Turk." The same year Bulgaria, aided by Russia, won autonomy and was made into a principality under nominal Turkish suzerainty; but not until 1908 did she fully throw off the Sultan's rule and become an independent kingdom.⁶ But what is important to remember is that the Congress of Berlin in 1878 forced Bulgaria to give up what the Bulgarians considered their full territorial possessions. At that time Bulgaria lost Thrace and Macedonia, territories which she has been trying ever since to regain.

In 1879 the National Assembly elected Prince Alexander of Battenberg as first Prince of Bulgaria. In 1885 the East Rumelian government in Philippopolis was overthrown by a revolution, and the region united with the Principality. There ensued a successful war against the resentful Serbs. A year later, Russia, provoked by Alexander's Bulgarian nationalism, instigated his kidnapping and his abdication. In 1887 Prince Ferdinand of Coburg was elected in Alexander's place by the angry Bulgarian nationalists.

From 1912 to 1919, Bulgaria was in a continual state of warfare. Tsar Ferdinand joined the First Balkan War against Turkey, hoping to obtain Macedonia and a frontage on the Aegean. He miscalculated Bulgaria's further chances by striking against his allies in the Second Balkan War in 1913. Defeated, Bulgaria had to give up the Dobrudja to Romania and lost practically all Macedonia to Serbia and Greece. Betting again on the wrong horse during World War I by becoming a partner of the Central Powers, Bulgaria saw her Aegean hopes grow dimmer. Tsar Ferdinand had to resign in favor of his son, Boris.

For the achievement of Bulgaria's nationalistic ambitions, three wars had been waged since the Berlin settlement of 1878. With the same end in view, Bulgaria joined the Axis in 1941. Under Nazi ascendancy over the Balkans, Bulgaria obtained southern Dobrudja, part of Thrace, Macedonia, and the western provinces that were annexed by Serbia in 1919. As an Axis satellite, Bulgaria's nationalism reached the zenith in political and territorial expansion.

⁶ For the relation of the Macedonia movement to Bulgaria's historical fortunes, see Anastasoff, *loc. cit.*; Joseph S. Roucek, *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1939). Ch. VIII, "Macedonians," pp. 138-151.

CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Bulgarian Constitution dates back to 1879; it was amended May, 1893, and June, 1911.⁷ Bulgaria was (up to 1946) a constitutional kingdom, the throne being hereditary to the male descendants of Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, who was elected in 1897 and assumed the title "Tsar" in 1908. The Constitution was suspended after a military *coup d'état* on May 19, 1934, and remained suspended during the terms of office of the successive cabinets.

While the Constitution contained numerous advanced democratic features, we must distinguish between the excellent intentions of its framers and the actual operation of Bulgarian politics. Prince Alexander suspended it for two years. His example was gleefully followed by Prince (later Tsar) Ferdinand, who disregarded it most of the time for nearly half a century. Stambuliski and Tsankoff, Premiers after World War I, worried not at all about constitutional niceties, and Boris paid little attention to them during the last years of his reign.

Bulgaria, during its first fifty years of national existence, was headed by 37 ministries, of which only four were formed from among the majority in the National Assembly. The Tsar's powers of dissolution were also widely misused. The Assembly itself was not averse to using unconstitutional methods; for instance, the seventeenth Assembly on March 7, 1918, passed an act whereby its term of four years was extended indefinitely, in express contravention of Article 86 of the Constitution. The judges did not enjoy adequate permanency of tenure. As the King could remove any official at will, both civil and military, the King's will was the final word in the country. One can say, in general, that the applications of the Bulgarian Constitution showed that it was flexible enough, or misinterpreted enough, to allow autocratic government to run on theoretically democratic foundations.

Local Government. For local administration, the country was

⁷ A text can be found in H. F. Wright, *The Constitutions of the States at War* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 87-104. See also T. Geshkoff, "The Constitution of Bulgaria," in Bulgaria Student Association in New York City, *Pages From Bulgaria's Life* (New York, 1927), pp. 49-57; E. Zlatanoff, *La Constitution Bulgare et ses Principes* (Paris: Labor, 1926); S. Balamezow, *La Constitution de Tirnovo* (Sofia, 1925). See also C. E. Black, *The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1944).

divided into seven counties, each under a local governor. The counties were divided into districts, each under a district governor, and the districts into municipalities, each under a mayor. All these officials were appointed by the Minister of the Interior. In 1934 the following judicial institutions were in existence: district and county courts, courts of appeal, the Supreme Administrative Court, and the Supreme Court of Cassation (at Sofia).

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF BULGARIA'S POLITICS

The political life of Bulgaria has always been stormy and violent, if not chaotic. The prewar (1914) political record shows one suspension of the Constitution, a kidnapping and a forcible dethronement of the first of Bulgaria's rulers, four wars and an involuntary abdication of the second of her rulers. The records of the period following World War I show a class war, a *coup d'état* followed by political and civil murders, and a kind of civil war, combined with dictatorship at first by the Left (the Agrarians) and then by the Right. Extraordinary influence was exercised and a series of political murders committed by the illegal government of the deadly IMRO (Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization). Two serious attempts were made on the life of the late King Boris before he died under highly suspicious circumstances, not to speak of similar attempts made upon the lives of numerous politicians and statesmen. Another *coup d'état* occurred in 1934, only to be followed by a third in 1935 and by a Nazi overlordship of the country during World War II.

A proper historical perspective offers an explanation of these problems. When the nation regained its liberty in the second half of the nineteenth century, a new administration had to be organized and the diverse organs of the national life had to be improvised at a moment's notice, and practically out of nothing. Hardly any institutions of the Turkish regime could be utilized. A modern state had to be formed out of a country which had been devastated and exploited for centuries under the Turk.

Very soon there appeared on the scene young men, most of them trained in schools outside of their country, who set themselves up as political leaders. Paying very little attention, if, indeed, any at all, to the interests of the peasant masses, these leaders looked for a living from political spoils. Unfortunately,

there were soon not enough political appointments to go around, and bitter personal differences arose among the various political personalities. As in other Balkan states, party connections tended to become private political feuds. Furthermore, the indifference and the inability of the peasant masses to enforce their demands was conducive to the ignoring of their needs by the politicians.

In fact, the pre-1914 programs of the various political groups did not differ much. All favored the economic development of the state, it is true, and often hasty reforms were introduced. But the leaders and their programs actually catered to the interests of the professional and urban classes of the nation. The town, therefore, ruled the village. Personalities were more important than any principles and measures. Emphasis on the outstanding personality of each group became the distinguishing feature of each party.

In Bulgaria, the party crumbles with the declining influence of the leader, or with his inability to provide enough spoils. Personal feelings, emotions, and favoritism predominate in the relation of the party supporters to their chief, and in the relation of the party leader to political affairs of the nation. As a result, violent struggles, often devoid of political principle, are the one distinguishing feature of Bulgaria's political life. Most of the leading politicians of the country have been at one time or another in exile or in prison; others have disappeared in the tempest of executions. Revenge and hate indiscriminately sever personal friends or unite violent enemies when politics are involved.

King Ferdinand also left his impress on Bulgaria's form of politics. He did not hesitate to use Machiavellian tactics to achieve his ends. This "old fox" organized his "personal regime" so well that he ruled as well as reigned. He and some parties of the right brought Bulgaria into World War I, with disastrous effect on the nation.

Since Bulgaria had lost the war, in the first period after World War I, nationalism, militarism, and conservatism went completely out of style. The peasant masses began their short but violent reign. The reaction against the domination of the bourgeois parties had already begun before the war. A few peasant leaders had started their missionary work among the peasants, and had tried to organize them in the prewar days. But the peasant came into

power only after the war, on the wave of complete reaction against the old parties. Following the downfall of the peasant leader, Stambuliski, the bourgeois representatives returned to power in 1923. The violence of civil strife abated only gradually, and ceased, for a while only, after 1931 when the representatives of the peasantry were allowed to make up another government coalition.

From 1923 on, the intelligentsia and the urban and professional groups were again able to exert political influence out of all proportion to their numerical strength. It is true that Stambuliski reduced their strength and power. Most of the bourgeois leaders were discredited and mistrusted because they had brought their country to the Canossa of military defeat. But the anti-bourgeois policy of Stambuliski's peasant regime united the bourgeois forces with the Macedonians and the military leaders. This thin upper layer of the bourgeoisie again reasserted its political power although its ranks remained divided into numerous personal followings. The town, therefore, again ruled the village.

Before World War II every Bulgarian with any education, every school-teacher and every student in the secondary and upper institutions of learning, aimed to be elected to Parliament and to take up politics as his life's vocation. For example, in 1927, 4,000 candidates competed for 273 seats in Parliament. After all, remuneration connected with parliamentary seats was quite generous, considering the low standard of living of Bulgaria. The platforms of the parties, with the exception of the extreme Left—the Agrarians, Socialists, and Communists—were practically indistinguishable, but their proponents stressed their uniqueness with rash fanaticism. This same fanaticism extended to the party press, which was vulgar to the extreme and printed both warranted and unwarranted personal abuse.⁸

⁸ This is exemplified by the press reports accompanying the attempt upon the life of Professor Tsankoff at Tehepino, on August 17, 1933, as reported in *The Near East and India* (September 21, 1933), p. 779. Dr. Tsankoff at once declared (after the attack) "that the Agrarians were the instigators—an accusation prompted, obviously, by recollection of his followers' acts, of which some Agrarians bear marks which are perpetual reminders. The Agrarians retorted by declaring that Tsankoff had staged the affair himself to give weight to his words—and some among them added that they would hate to see him die prematurely, for they hope he may be driven insane by reflection upon his past iniquities. These pleasantries reveal the spirit of the times in Bulgaria."

PUBLIC OPINION

The Bulgarian is extremely sensitive to foreign opinion. He tries to imitate the modern western spirit. To call him "conservative" is to arouse personal and political resentment. Such words as *Liberal* and *Progressive* are much in use—without, however, having much inner meaning. In fact, the qualities which the Bulgarian masses have shown are largely the result of history: docility under their governors, endurance and patience with their lot. The lack of political experience is quite obvious, and for lack of ability to make up his own mind, the Bulgarian has had to accept the opinions put before him by over-ardent nationalists, by his rulers, and by self-seekers. It is interesting to note that a neutral program has never suited the Bulgarian temperament.

Personal bitterness reaches its highest pitch during the elections, which are characterized by general over-excitement. Every citizen belonging to the "educated" class wants to play a very active role and is not content with passive participation. Electoral violence is inevitable, and every kind of pressure is used. There are numerous pre-election meetings; fiery party orators use exaggerated expressions and are ready to promise anything to the voters. All available places are covered with multi-colored posters accusing the opponents in abusive terms, and extolling the virtues and accomplishments of the particular party sponsoring the posters. All possible political tricks are utilized. Officially, of course, the elections are "free." But there is the usual interference of government officials, and in some districts force is used. Only the extreme discontent of the peasantry occasionally overcomes these obstacles and forces the recording of their dissatisfaction.

Just as the center of political gatherings in the villages is the village pump or the local saloon, in the cities political opinion often is crystallized into its more excitable and concrete forms in the coffee-houses. Each political cluster gathers in its favorite coffee-house which soon becomes known as the meeting place of the leaders and supporters of this or that group. There the unofficial business is carried on, the official secretariat of each party transacting the usual routine work.

THE SHADOW OF THE IMRO

A very unhealthy influence in Bulgarian politics has always been exerted by the illegal secret Macedonian organization and by the military. The long series of murders and executions carried on by the dreaded IMRO is something which can hardly be comprehended by a western observer not inclined to favor the Fascist and Nazi methods. Open warfare in the streets of Sofia and the ruthless disposal of persons who dared to question the wishes of Mihailoff, leader of the IMRO, were quite extraordinary in the political procedures of European countries before the rise of Fascism and Nazism.⁹

The whole question was of course complicated by the fact that the population of Bulgaria included 600,000 to 700,000 Macedonians, or citizens of Macedonian origin. The ability of the IMRO to carry on its assassinations while the Bulgarian Government lacked the strength or willingness to stop them can be explained only by the extreme patriotic attitude of the Bulgarian public towards the Macedonians, who claimed that they fought for the liberation of Macedonia from Yugoslavia.

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

The tendency of the Bulgarian politicians to imitate western methods resulted in the formation of the Socialist Party, which in prewar days was stronger there than in any other Balkan state. However, it had really no social basis, as the industrial population in the country was small. The same lack of social foundation applies to the Communist Party.¹⁰ The ever-growing number of adherents to the Communist ranks can be explained by the economic condition of the country, as well as by the growth of a

⁹ For more details, see Joseph S. Rousek, *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939), Ch. VIII, "Macedonians," pp. 138-150. Although the Government of Bulgaria always disclaimed an open connection with IMRO, it appears (according to Michael Peters, "Boris Fears Revolt, Murders Hundreds," *PM*, May 25, 1942, p. 14) that through his Intelligence Department, headed by Col. Nicho Georgiev, an intimate friend of the King, Boris had for years been in actual control of the IMRO.

¹⁰ George Dimitrov, secretary-general of the Comintern, was born in Bulgaria. It was he who, when on trial by the Nazis for the Reichstag fire, baited Prussian Premier Hermann Goering into a shaking, gibbering rage; in 1946 he became Bulgaria's Premier.

pro-Russian, pan-Slavonic sentiment, particularly after the occupation of the country by the Nazis. The situation is aggravated further by the poverty of the intelligentsia and of Bulgarian youth. There is a chronic discontent over arrears in salaries and pensions. This has been the cause of communistic tendencies among officials and the huge army of pensioners.

THE PEASANTRY

The Bulgarian peasant leads a laborious life. Bread and cheese alone are his usual food, with a little meat as a rare treat, and a glass of vodka as his indulgence for Sundays and feast days only. Marrying early, he is astonishingly fecund. In the agricultural field, the peasant is gradually abandoning primitive methods. There has been an increase in the number of plows (iron and motor) and of sowing, harvesting, threshing, and other machines. However, the small divisions of land are disadvantageous. The patriarchal form of family is disappearing and the *zadruga*¹¹ is almost non-existent. Cityward migration from the rural districts is discernible.

Ordinarily a placid man, the Bulgarian peasant becomes cruel and a very good soldier when aroused. He is less quick-witted than the Greek, less "temperamental" than the Serbian, and less apt to absorb the externals of civilization than the Romanian. However, he exhibits to a remarkable degree the qualities of patience, perseverance, endurance, and capacity for laborious effort. He is reserved, taciturn or unresponsive with everyone, and cold, indifferent, or suspicious toward strangers. Bitter experience has taught him not to appear hospitable, and he is less inclined to offer hospitality in comparison with the other Slavs. In fact, all classes of Bulgarians practice thrift bordering on parsimony, and resent any display of wealth. At times they are egotistical and ungrateful. But the peasant is high spirited, and not bad-tempered. Political agitation is the only thing likely to lead to bloodshed. The winter is the most propitious time for discussing politics; and the Bulgarian peasant is an ardent politician,

¹¹ See L. Petroff, "Peasant Primary Groups in Bulgaria," *Sociology and Social Research*, XIII (1928-1929), pp. 557-565. The *zadruga* was a large kinship organization of the gentile form.

without being able to derive many benefits from it. In regard to religious matters, the influence of the priesthood is limited, as the peasant is not fanatical in his beliefs.

Essentially, the Bulgarian peasant finds socialism, communism, and radicalism more or less alien to his convictions. It can be safely assumed that radicalism and communism have a positive correlation with urbanization. This is evident from the figures of the Bulgarian elections of 1923 for the National Assembly, showing the percentage of votes cast for the Communist Party.¹²

This seems to prove that the radicalism of the peasant classes of Bulgaria is promoted more by economic distress than by rationalistic or emotional convictions. By inclination the Bulgarian peasantry is individualistic, patriotic, thrifty; but now the peasant is obliged to sell one kilogram of wheat to buy a box of matches and seven kilograms of wheat for one kilogram of common nails. Such a desperate situation makes him pessimistic, rather amenable to Marxist theories. Though he is very nationalistic, his social outlook is narrow. His obligations, according to his best judgment, are directed primarily towards his family, his state and his nation; his main devotion is to the land and cattle, and not to society. The idea of common good does not extend further than his family group. Having suffered for some five hundred years from his oppressors, the government officials who were either aliens or members of the city intelligentsia and bourgeoisie, the Bulgarian peasant is by tradition and sentiment against domination of others and hostile to the state and its representatives. This view is expressed in the numberless peasant songs celebrating the *haiduks* of Bulgaria, the Bulgarian "Robin Hoods," who won their fame by opposing state authority, shooting down the state officials and robbing the rich people. His Greek Orthodox religion has constituted for him the chief spiritual and social force of Bulgarian nationalism through the past centuries. The misfor-

¹² P. A. Sorokin, C. C. Zimmerman, C. J. Galpin, *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1932), Vol II, p. 450 ff., citing *Annuaire Statistique de Royaume de Bulgarie, 1923-24*, p. 49.

Province	Percentage	
	Urban	Rural
Varna	30.2	20.0
Plovdiv	24.8	15.4
Rousse	25.6	6.8
Sofia	23.2	13.9

tune of the Bulgarian peasant has been due to the fact that the social values produced and represented by him have not been fully appreciated.

KING BORIS

The tragedy of King Boris was that, like his father before him, he picked the wrong horse in international politics. When Boris made terms with Hitler while on a trip to Berlin in the fall of 1940, he set in motion a pattern of events similar to that which followed the unfortunate decision of his father, Ferdinand I, to ally his country with the Central Powers in World War I. That decision forced Ferdinand to abdicate his throne and brought Bulgaria to the brink of ruin. Boris' decision, whether coming from the external compulsion too strong to resist or from private inclination, brought him the loss of the confidence of his people and provoked seething discontent within his country. The die was cast on March 1, 1941, when Bulgaria joined the Axis. The familiar Nazi infiltration tactics already had begun and Boris became, as he had been twice before in his reign, a puppet king.

Boris ascended the throne on October 3, 1918, at the age of 24. World War I was still raging outside the kingdom; inside there was strife verging almost on anarchy. But he then had the confidence of his people, among whom he had been reared and in whose army he had served. With courage and tact he succeeded in establishing authority.

Unlike Ferdinand who ruled unconstitutionally, but legally never abandoned parliamentary government, Boris twice during the first 16 years of his reign permitted dictatorship to rule the country without royal protest. From 1919 to 1923, though the Parliament (*Sobranie*) was retained, the royal authority was reduced almost to the vanishing point under the Agrarian Premier Alexander Stambuliski, who campaigned against the bourgeoisie with methods closely resembling those of the Russian bolsheviks. In 1934 and 1935 a military dictatorship under Colonel Kimon Georgiev ruled the country and even went to the extreme of dissolving Parliament.

Throughout all these years there were disorders and border disputes, and sometimes there was grave threat of civil war. In 1921 a bomb exploded near the King as he was watching a parade in Sofia. In 1925 revolutionaries ambushed his automobile, kill-

ing his chauffeur and another occupant. The King himself, though a bullet grazed his mustache, took the wheel and drove into the nearest town for military aid. The next day General Georgiev was murdered, and at his funeral in the Cathedral in Sofia a bomb exploded, killing 123 persons and wounding 323. During 1924 alone there were 200 assassinations in Bulgaria.

Yet Boris scorned danger and rarely kept to his palace. In Sofia he walked the streets freely, without benefit of bodyguards. Often he drove his car through the countryside and stopped to chat with peasants and villagers. He was generally recognized as the most accomplished royal linguist on the Continent.

From his father, Boris inherited an aptitude and liking for botany, natural history and mechanics. It was said of him that he knew as much about an automobile engine as any mechanic in Bulgaria. But his chief hobby was driving locomotives. For many years Boris, like King Edward VIII of England, was known as a "bachelor king." In 1930, after gaining the Pope's consent for the wedding on condition that all children of the marriage be brought up in the Roman faith, he married the third daughter of King Victor Emmanuel III of Italy. An heir to the throne, Crown Prince Simeon, was born June 16, 1937.

On the whole, until the spring of 1934 Boris avoided making political decisions, allowing political trends to take their natural course. In 1934 the Bulgarian Army abolished Parliament and established Boris as the somewhat bewildered figurehead of a military dictatorship. Boris buckled down to serious work and within a year made himself the actual dictator after having been for eight months virtually a prisoner of the government. In June, 1935, General Petko Zlateff was appointed as Premier of the King's personal government. Other Premiers followed, with Boris carefully playing one faction against another. In October, 1938, the Macedonians, by killing General Peyeff, the Chief of the General Staff, tried a *coup d'état*, but the plot was unsuccessful and thousands were arrested.

The King's pro-Axis policy won southern Dobrudja from Rumania in September, 1940. But Boris had to pay for Hitler's support. He joined the satellites in declaring war on the United States, December 13, 1941. Although Boris introduced Nazi measures against democrats and Jews, they were not strictly enforced. And he refused to declare war against Russia. The Bulgarians had always had a historic, linguistic and racial sympathy for Rus-

sia, which not even the advent of Soviet Communism destroyed. When the German lines sagged in Russia and the Mediterranean, and Berlin demanded greater help from Sofia, Boris stalled.

Not long afterwards, on August 28, 1943, the King died under highly suspicious circumstances while returning, broken in health, from a stormy visit with Adolf Hitler.

THE COLLAPSE

When Boris died, more German troops marched into the country. A Regency council, chosen by Berlin, assumed power on behalf of six-year-old Simeon II. Prince Cyril, Boris' brother, was one of the four Regents; another was Professor Filov, a Nazi mouthpiece since 1940 and one of the ablest men in the Balkans.

After Romania turned against the Germans in 1944, Bulgaria hastened to get on the Allied bandwagon. The government sent emissaries to Cairo to confer with the representatives of England and the United States. But this looked to Moscow like an effort to flirt with the Allies and to cooperate quietly with Germany at the same time. Suddenly, on September 5, 1944, Moscow declared war against Bulgaria. The astounded government of Sofia asked for an armistice within six hours. The Russians gave them the silent treatment and then demanded that Bulgaria declare war on Germany. After four hours of Bulgarian indecision, the Red Army crossed the Danube. The Muraviev's government fell and another was formed by Colonel Kimon Georgiev; it promptly declared war on Germany.

BULGARIA UNDER SOVIET RUSSIA'S THUMB

When the Russian troops marched into Bulgaria, they were accompanied by Georgi Dimitrov, the outstanding Bulgarian Communist, who was charged with the mission of transforming the kingdom into a Communist state. The son of a revolutionary workman, Dimitrov staged his first rebellion at the age of 12; sent to an American mission school to study for the ministry, he provoked a quarrel with the minister, got himself expelled and went to work as a printer in Sofia. At 18 he became Secretary of the Printers' Union. He joined the *Tesnyak* Party, which, like the

Bolshevik group in Russia, broke away from the Social Democratic Party to conduct the class struggle. In 1904, at 22, he organized a national federation of trade unions, and remained its secretary until 1923. Between 1908 and 1912, he personally took part in 680 strikes. In 1913, after reaching the required age of 30, he was elected to the National Assembly and retained that seat for 10 years. But he spent most of the last five years in jail or fighting underground against what he termed the "imperialistic war" and leading illegal postwar strikes.

In 1920, disguised as a fisherman, he set out in a sailboat on the Black Sea for Russia to attend the Second Congress of the Communist International. Driven ashore in Romania by a storm, he was charged with espionage, but stern Soviet representations, aided by bribery, won his release. He reached Russia in time for the Third Congress in 1921 and was elected to the Comintern's Executive Committee.

Turmoil gripped Bulgaria after a military *coup* in June, 1923. In September, Dimitrov called an armed uprising against King Boris, and after pitched battles in northwest Bulgaria, his 1,000 armed workers were forced to retreat into Yugoslavia. Ten years as Comintern chief in the Balkans followed. Dimitrov was finally arrested by the Nazis and charged with complicity in the Reichstag fire. Denied the right to choose his own counsel, he conducted his own defense in picturesque but fluent German, which he had learned during seven months' imprisonment. His speech during the trial convinced the world that the Nazis themselves had set the fire to Parliament as a pretext for terrorism. It put Goering in a rage. At the end, the prosecutor was forced to ask the court for acquittal. Released by the court, Dimitrov was clapped back into jail immediately by the Gestapo. Stalin finally obtained his freedom by conferring Soviet citizenship upon him. Goering's agents put a time bomb in the German-manned plane that carried him to Moscow, but a Reichswehr officer removed the bomb-laden suitcase to save the crew, and the plot was thwarted.

The Fatherland Front. Upon his return to Bulgaria in 1945, Dimitrov organized the Fatherland Front as the basis of the Georgiev Government. In reality, it was an instrument for Communist domination. At first it was a coalition containing genuine non-Communist elements, especially Agrarians, but eventually, aside from the Communists, it contained only a few renegade

Socialists, a number of Agrarians, several castoffs of a former Radical Party, and Zvenoites, who had been for many years military conspirators.

Under the leadership of Dimitrov, the Communists in many villages started gathering the peasants' fields into big "blocks," wiping out landmarks and obliterating all outward signs of private property. The peasants, while theoretically owners, were formed into work brigades, directed by brigade bosses. That would increase Bulgaria's production, but it placed each "peasant cooperator" at the mercy of the "boss," who controlled the machinery, the animals and the food.

Among Dimitrov's collaborators, Tsola Dragoicheva, "one of the cruelest imperialist agents that ever operated in the Balkans,"¹³ visited America as a representative to the pan-Slavic Congress held in New York City in 1946.

Mrs. Dragoicheva went into underground work long before the last war broke out and distinguished herself as a revolutionist. She became a chief member of the Communist Party's Central Revolutionary Committee, was condemned to death, served in prison, escaped, went to Russia, and was brought back by the Russians to operate in Bulgaria as a Partisan and prepare for the setting up of a Communist regime. On September 9, 1944, under pressure of the Red Army, a Communist-led, dictatorial Bulgarian regime was set up, designed to work behind the false front of a "democratic coalition." Having acquired power, the first task of the Communists was to organize it; the real authority was largely in the hands of the National Committee of the Fatherland Front, directed by Mrs. Dragoicheva. Communist punishment was soon not restricted to actual "Fascists." While notorious Fascists, willing to serve the Communists, were spared, some of the most irreproachable democrats in Bulgaria who refused to accept Communist dictatorship were killed. Special terror was directed against the Socialists and the Peasant Party, the most democratic groups in the country.

The number of Bulgarians killed "officially" was about 3,000. But actually the number of those killed under the directions of the so-called People's Courts was four or five times larger. All the judges in each case, except the President of the Court, were Partisans. Prince Cyril was among those executed.

¹³ Reuben H. Markham, "A Bulgarian Lady Executioner," *New Leader* (October 5, 1946), p. 8 ff.

THE REPUBLIC

On September 8, 1946, a Republic was proclaimed by a popular vote. The boy King Simeon went into exile. After the referendum changed the country from a monarchy into a republic, a Communist-managed general election on October 27, 1946, gave the Communists 277 out of 465 seats in the National Assembly. The elections also ended the political career of Premier Georgiev, who, after faithfully serving the interests of the Soviets, was not even reelected. He was promptly succeeded by Dimitrov, who headed the government of ten Communists, five government Agrarians, two Socialists, two Zveno party members and one independent. The Communists then prepared to discard the Fatherland Front now that it had served their purpose. Protests by the United States and British Governments against the unfairness of the elections and the terroristic methods of the Soviet-controlled regime proved unavailing.

The Peace Treaty. The terms of the peace treaty imposed on Bulgaria by the Big Four Council of Foreign Ministers were made public January 17, 1947.¹⁴ Bulgaria was required to pay a war indemnity of \$45,000,000 to Greece and of \$25,000,000 to Yugoslavia. It returned to Greece and Yugoslavia the territories it had annexed from them during the war but retained southern Dobrudja, ceded by Romania in 1940. Bulgaria's military forces were restricted to a land army of 55,000; anti-aircraft artillery with a personnel strength of 1,800; a total naval tonnage of 7,250 with a personnel strength of 3,500; and an air force of 90 planes (70 of combat type) with a personnel strength of 5,200. The treaty provided that Allied (Russian) forces were to be withdrawn from the country within 90 days after the treaty went into force.

RECENT TRENDS

Dimitrov was firmly in the saddle during 1947. A new Constitution was adopted by the National Assembly on December 4, 1947.¹⁵ Bulgaria was proclaimed a "People's Republic with a representative government," with the National Assembly as the

¹⁴ For text of the treaty, see *The New York Times*, January 18, 1947

¹⁵ The text can be found in: *Free Bulgaria* (12 Narodno Sobranie Sq., Sofia), II, 23 (December 15, 1947), pp. 1-8.

supreme organ of the state power. The document was marked by the usual excessive number of words, trying to tell the Bulgarian people the Bulgarian version of the Soviet prototype. An additional step was taken on February 4, 1948, when Bulgaria became a one-party state, her internal and foreign policies openly modeled on and wedded to the U.S.S.R. The Fatherland Front, led by Dimitrov and the Communists but including representatives of four other political parties, was transformed from a loose federation of political organizations into a single political organization. Its directives were binding not only upon the affiliated parties but also upon all their members. It was the last step toward the liquidation of any open political opposition in this country. The new Constitution provided that while all five old parties forming the Fatherland Front were automatically members of the Front, members of each party could join local Fatherland Front organizations only on an individual basis. Any persons expelled from or barred from a local Fatherland Front may not be admitted subsequently to any member party of the Fatherland Front. Each party is required to abandon its local block, ward, city, and district organizations and to serve the direction of Fatherland Front subdivisions. State control of all youth education is to be made complete and all private religious primary and secondary schools are to be closed. That party frankly declared its foreign policy is based primarily upon that of the U.S.S.R. and secondarily upon "fraternity and unity with the peoples of Yugoslavia, including the creation of a federation of South Slavs." It mentioned, however, only the "further construction of one system of friendship, international collaboration and mutual assistance with Yugoslavia, Romania, Albania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland for joint defense against all aggression and for economic advantage." On the troublesome Greek issue the Fatherland Front voted "sincere friendship with democratic Greece fighting for its national independence."

Along these pro-Soviet lines, Dimitrov signed several treaties with Yugoslavia (as described in the previous chapter on Yugoslavia).

Strangely enough, however, Dimitrov, Tito, and other Soviet satellites of central-eastern Europe was pedaling too far and too fast for Moscow by the turn of 1948. A federation of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Poland would comprise some 447,000 square miles and 81 million

people; with the passing of Germany's might from the complicated structure of power politics of Europe, it would become Europe's most formidable power, outside the U.S.S.R., with its growing armies, resources of coal, oil, and some highly developed industry. This was too much for Moscow's liking. When Dimitrov signed a treaty of alliance with Romania in January, 1948, he was spanked by Moscow's *Pravda*; on the surface he did not seem to mind too much. As an old-line and old-time Communist he was accustomed to the twists and turns of Soviet policies, and accepting calmly the verdict that the Balkans "do not need a problematical and artificial federation or confederation or customs union"; what they do need is merely the organization of "domestic popular democratic forces" as foreseen by the nine communist parties of the Cominform.¹⁶

In the background of Moscow's change of mind was a new conciliatory attitude toward the West. The straws in the new wind were: Moscow modified demands on Austria, the reopening of Soviet-American Lend-Lease negotiations, Soviet Ambassador Alexander Paniushkin's statement in Washington promoting increased Soviet-American trade and the lack of the usual violent outbursts in Soviet press against such American steps as: the reopening of the Mellaha air base in Libya, visits of American warships to Italy, and the participation of American officers in Iran's opposition to Soviet demands. But, above all, the main consideration was but a geopolitical consideration of the situation by Moscow of the possibilities involved: a federation might become too independent or too strong, and it was much easier to handle each Balkan state separately—and especially as mutually competing and jealous states. And, after all, a federation would prevent the possibility of having these individual states join the U.S.S.R. as Soviet republics.

Internally, Dimitrov, between 1947 and 1948, was preparing the ground for the formal creation of a one-party state as already pointed out. The Constituent Assembly elections of April 9, 1947, were boycotted by "the independence first" parties—in vain; on June 12, the Assembly deprived 23 Agrarian (opposition) Deputies of their seats. On July 9, Dimitrov's government declined the invitation to Paris to consider the Marshall Plan, on the ground that it did not wish to revise its own Two-Year Plan

¹⁶ See the previous chapter, on Yugoslavia, for the formation and operation of the Cominform.

or take part in a move that would "lead to the division of Europe into two hostile camps." On August 26, the Agrarian Party was dissolved, and Mikola Petkov, one of its leaders, was executed on September 22, at midnight, "for treason." The United States Department of State called his execution "a gross miscarriage of justice." Further arrests were made of the real or possible critics of the regime. On October 1, 1947, the United States resumed full diplomatic relations with Bulgaria, accompanied with a statement that "The United States Government wishes to make clear that this step does not reflect either approval or condonation of certain actions of the Bulgarian Government."

In accordance with the new Constitution of December 4, 1947, the National Assembly elected to the Presidium: President, Dr. Mincho Neichev (Communist); Vice-Presidents, Cyril Klisurski (Agrarian) and Dimitar Neikov (Social Democrat); Secretary, Jordan Chuvanov (Communist); Speaker, Raicho Damyanov. The Presidium has 15 members (9 Communists, 2 Agrarians, 2 Zveno Union, 1 Social Democrat, and 1 Radical). In the re-formed Cabinet, appointed on December 10, the Communist Party held 14 posts, Agrarian Party 5, Zveno Union 2, and Social Democratic Party 2.

Meanwhile, on August 29, 1947, the Soviet government, in a surprise move, ratified Bulgaria's peace treaty—together with the other peace treaties of the five Nazi satellites (Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Italy, and Finland).¹⁷ Russia's sudden step meant much more than an earnest gesture of good-will and cooperation. It may mean that Soviet Russia regards her domination of central-eastern-Balkan Europe, except for Greece—whose independence the United States was making desperate efforts to maintain in 1948—as virtually complete. Between the signing of the treaties and their ratification, the Kremlin had been steadily consolidating its position by allowing a new political underworld to seize the governments of the signatories. The new dictators, and thus also those of Bulgaria, strutted about proclaiming their "revolution," threatening their neighbors, and even defying their victors with what an American note called "inadmissible insolence." At the same time, on the economic front, the Soviet Union hastily

¹⁷ See: Joseph S. Roucek, "The Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Hungarian Peace Treaties," pp. 97-105, in T. V. Kalijarvi, ed., "Peace Settlements of World War II," *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCLVII (May, 1948).

buttressed its economic spite fence; shotgun economic treaties herded them more snugly into the Soviet economic pen. These trade treaties, like reparations, were instruments of extortion, and were in method straight out of the Nazi mold. Yet, during the debates on the value of the European Recovery Program, the Kremlin talked about possible United States interference in the "sovereign rights" of the old Nazi satellite states. This point was probably made in anticipation of the failure to execute the peace treaties, which will be mainly of semantic value rather than evidential of sincere observance of solemn documents.

For the formation of a one-party state at the turn of 1948, Bulgaria, just like her neighbors (Romania, Yugoslavia, and Albania) became a total satellite of the U.S.S.R.—and did her best to engulf Greece in these pro-Soviet trends.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BLACK, C. E., *The Establishment of Constitutional Government in Bulgaria* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1944). A valuable scholarly introduction.
- CLARKE, J. F., "Bobchev and Bulgaria," *Slavonic and East European Review*, XXI (March, 1943), pp. 188-193.
- LEHRMAN, HAL, *Russia's Europe* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1948). Describes the pattern of Soviet power not only in Bulgaria, but also in Yugoslavia, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Austria.
- LOGIC, G. C., *Bulgaria, Problems and Politics* (London: Heinemann, 1919). A general review of Bulgaria's politics before and during World War I.
- MARKHAM, R. H., *Meet Bulgaria* (Sofia: American Mission, 1931). One of the best readable introductions.
- , *Tito's Imperial Communism* (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1947). Contains a bitter blast against the pro-Soviet Bulgarian regime.
- MOSELY, P. E., "The Post-War Historiography of Modern Bulgaria," *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. IX (September, 1937).
- PASVOLSKY, LEO, *Bulgaria's Economic Position* (Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution, 1930). Especially good on the economic problems.
- ROUCEK, JOSEPH S., *Central-Eastern Europe* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1946), Chapters X and XXIV, pp. 205-213, 520-530; *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939),

Chapters VII, "Bulgaria," pp. 118-137, and VIII, "Macedonia," pp. 138-151.

TODOROV, KOSTA, *Balkan Firebrand* (Chicago: Ziff-Davis, 1943).
Memoirs of a Bulgarian politician and revolutionist.

GREECE

GEOPOLITICAL ASPECTS

Hellas has always been invaded throughout the centuries of her history. Since the barbarians crossed the center of power from southern to northern Europe, she has been a pawn in all great struggles for power. Salonica is a back door to Central Europe, a jumping-off place to the Dardanelles and the Black Sea. Rocky Greek islands straggle across the Aegean to the shores of Turkey. The Ionian Islands lie close to Italy; Crete, halfway to Africa.

Again, in World War II, as in World War I, when the first step in the dissolution of the Central Powers was taken by the invasion started in Salonica, Greece played a fateful role. The Italian invasion of Greece was agreed upon at Brenner Pass on Oct. 4, 1940, when Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini planned their drive to the east. For Greece was the key to control of two of the three routes to the east: by land and sea through Turkey, by sea via the Mediterranean. Even the third route was controlled by Greece: the capture of Crete was to help safeguard Italy's Libyan route into Egypt.

When, in March, 1947, London informed Washington that it no longer could give aid to Greece and Turkey, the United States suddenly came up against a diplomatic crisis, requiring momentous decisions all around the world. Without a \$250,000,000 loan to replace British help, Russia's "Iron Curtain" would stretch down to the Mediterranean; then Turkey, outflanked, could no longer resist Soviet demands for bases on her soil.

Economics. Only strategic reasons would justify wasting military effort, however small, on Greece. The country is rocky and arid, growing little food. Greece's occasional prosperity has been based on maritime trade, and with the bulk of Greek shipping charted to Britain, Italy was not to get that.

Greece is primarily an agricultural country, with more than

half of the gainfully employed population engaged in agricultural and related pursuits. Only about 16 per cent are in industry. Nevertheless, Greece is the most industrialized country in the Balkans, producing various food products, textiles, tobacco products, chemical goods, and building materials.

The country underwent a progressive, though not uninterrupted, process of territorial expansion between the formation of the Kingdom in 1830 and 1923 when the Treaty of Lausanne made new changes in the frontiers. The economic condition of the country was profoundly affected by vast migrations which, beginning with the Balkan Wars, culminated in the period of 1922-1924 when more than a million Greeks were ejected from Asia Minor and forced to find homes within the Greek state. This influx of Greek refugees, most of whom were rural workers, presented the difficult problem of finding a means of livelihood for them. Even as late as 1937 the refugee problem had still not been settled, when thousands were still homeless.

Although a high percentage of the gainfully employed population has been engaged in agriculture, the arable land in Greece is relatively restricted because of the mountainous character of the country; only about one-fifth of the total area being productive. In fact, the country generally has not been self-sufficient in foodstuffs, importing even fresh and preserved fish, although Greece has one of the longest coastlines in the world in proportion to its area.

Social Conditions. Land holdings in Greece are, on the whole, small. The prevalence of small holdings dates back to 1917 when large landed properties were expropriated by the government and divided into small plots which were distributed to the peasants. However, the farmers who were allotted land were not supplied with cattle or modern agricultural machinery. Consequently, primitive methods of land cultivation continued. On the other hand, industrial development was hampered by the lack of a native coal supply, by only a small hydro-electric development and by the necessity of importing many raw materials. Greece, in addition, has been greatly handicapped by inadequate means of communication. The difference between the city and country is striking. In the village the sense of social obligations and traditions dominates the social relations of its inhabitants, characterized by strong family loyalties. In the cities the standards of morals are dual.

Population. At the end of the last century the population of Greece was approximately 2,500,000. At the time of the general census in 1928 the population, largely as a result of territorial changes and migrations, had increased to 6,204,684, of whom 1,233,576 were inhabitants of the islands. According to the census taken in 1940 the total population numbered 7,336,000.

The various racial migrations which have been brought about by the wars from 1912 onwards, whether voluntary or compulsory, involving the transfer of nearly 2,500,000 Greeks, Bulgarians and Turks, have had the result of introducing homogeneity in the regions affected, where before there was great diversity. Thus the proportion of Greeks in the population of Macedonia and Western Thrace, which stood at 43 and 37 per cent before the Balkan Wars, was about 88 and 93 per cent before World War II. Of the Greek populations abroad, the most important ones remaining now are those in Constantinople, Cyprus, Egypt, the United States, and Russia. The remittances to the mother country from these Greeks established abroad form a considerable item in the annual trade balance.

HISTORY

Although the authentic history of Greece does not begin until about 776 B.C., the Greeks claim a continuous history of three thousand to four thousand years. But we can not be concerned with its details. Suffice it to say that in 46 B.C. Greece was completely conquered by Rome, and became a Roman province. But instead of becoming Romanized, it Hellenized the Romans. In 395 A.D. Greece became a part of the Byzantine Empire, which was already saturated with Greek ideas and was the center of civilization for one thousand years. Between 500-600 A.D. Greece was devastated by Slavs and Avars. Three years after Constantinople was captured by the Turks (1453) Greece came under Turkish rule.

In the eighteenth century the Russians took a hand in the revival of Greek resistance and supported two revolutions. During that time the Greeks found themselves in a position of growing importance at a time when the decline of the Ottoman Empire reopened the Eastern question. Few scholars knew about the Czechs or Bulgarians at that time, but every educated man knew of the glories of Greece "from which Europe drew an even deeper

inspiration.”¹ The Greek forgotten and neglected past was re-discovered.

At that time the Greeks, located at the crossroads of Mediterranean commerce, regarded the Greek Orthodox Church as their national heritage and soul. This had been the established church of the Byzantine Empire, an empire Greek in language with the Greek patriarch at Constantinople as its highest religious dignitary. Simultaneously, the Patriarch was the head of all Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire. This gave the heads of the Orthodox communities authority in judicial and financial as well as in religious matters. The Serbs, Bulgarians, Romanians and Albanians of the Orthodox faith were under the jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarchate, supporting it with their taxes. Moreover the Greeks played an important part in the Ottoman Empire as merchants, sailors, statesmen and diplomatic middlemen. They represented the continuity of the Byzantine Empire.

The claims of the rising Nationalists of Greece were based on the assumption that the Turks were not only infidels but also usurpers of an imperial dignity rightfully belonging to the Greeks.² In that claim the Greeks found themselves face to face with a similar claim by Russia. Catherine II named her first two grandsons Alexander and Constantine, affirming Russia's claim to the Eastern Empire. Russia acted as the protector of the Orthodox Church and of the Greeks in the Ottoman Empire. This forced the Greeks to look for other justifications than the religious ones to support their claim to Byzantium.

These justifications were found in the Greek language and classical inheritance, in which Europe's interest revived at the end of the eighteenth century. They connected Greek classical civilization with Western scholarship and the modern Western mind. The French Revolution stimulated this process, as well as Greek trade and shipping. Six years after Napoleon's downfall, the Greeks were the first of the subject nations in the Ottoman Empire successfully to raise the banner of nationalism and liberalism. Many Western lovers of liberty were fired by Byron's pas-

¹ Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), p. 534.

² According to the Greek legend, the last Byzantine Emperor, Constantine XI, had not died, but escaped through a secret opening of St. Sofia, to return whenever a Greek again sat on the imperial throne. The first king born in modern Greece received the name of Constantine.

sionate poetry and were rousing public opinion in their countries for the Greeks.³ The Treaty of Adrianople of Sept. 14, 1829 proclaimed Greece an independent state, although tributary to Turkey. A year later Turkey acquiesced to the complete independence of Greece. The new state was proclaimed a republic, and Count John Capodistrias, a Corfiote Greek, former Minister of Tsar Alexander I of Russia, was elected President. But he was murdered a year later. By the Treaty of London of May 7, 1832, Great Britain, France, Russia and Bavaria declared Greece an independent kingdom under the protection of the first three Powers, with Prince Otto of Bavaria as King. In 1862 Otto was ousted by a revolt and Prince George of Denmark ascended the throne as George I (1865-1913).

The area of Greece was increased in 1869 by the cession by Great Britain of the seven Ionian Islands. The Treaty of Berlin (1878) gave her Thessaly and parts of Epirus. A step backwards was the Greco-Turkish War which was lost by Greece. In 1908, however, Crete received autonomy under the control of the Great Powers and Prince George of Greece became its High Commissioner. Though Turkey offered to recognize the annexation of Crete to Greece, which was effected in 1912, Athens joined the anti-Turkish coalition in the first Balkan War that year. But King George was assassinated and Constantine took his place while the second Balkan War was in the offing. Bulgaria claimed Thessalonica, which was taken by the Greek Army. However the Serbian and Greek armies defeated Bulgaria, and the Bucharest Treaty gave the Greeks Southern Macedonia with Salonica.

During World War I Greece remained neutral for a while, in spite of the pro-Allied agitation of Eleutherios Venizelos, who in 1916 left Athens to form a counter-government in Salonica against the King. Constantine was forced to abdicate in June, 1917, and Venizelos, becoming Premier, declared war against the Central Powers. The Peace of Sèvres in 1920 promised Greece all she wanted at the expense of Turkey. But the Treaty was never to be enforced. For the Greco-Turkish War (1921-1922) ended in a disastrous defeat for Greece. King Constantine, who

³ President Monroe voiced the sympathies of America in his annual message to the American Congress on Dec. 4, 1822. The Senate, moved by the eloquence of Daniel Webster, passed resolutions of encouragement. Numerous Philhellenic Societies were formed.

had returned to Greece in 1920, was forced to abdicate in September 1922 in favor of King George II. He in turn had to face the dethronement of the dynasty and the proclamation of the Republic in 1924, with Admiral Condouriotis as first President. The subsequent period was full of political changes and revolts. It resulted, after a period of domination by Venizelos, in a well-managed plebiscite which brought the return of King George II in November, 1935.

CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The evolution of constitutionalism in Greece from the time when the nation proclaimed its struggle for freedom (1821) to the present can be divided into six periods, which also cover various governmental forms: (1) the revolutionary constitution; (2) the period of absolute monarchy or of King Otto I (1833-1843); (3) the constitutional monarchy of Otto (1844-1862); (4) the period of application of the Constitution of 1864, which was theoretically enforced up to December, 1923; (5) the period dominated by the Constitution of June 3, 1927; and (6) the period of King George which saw the restoration of the monarchy, the suspension of the constitutional rule, and the Nazi conquest.⁴

The orgy of constitution making in Greece received a tremendous impetus from French practices, and has continued unabated ever since. Between 1821 and 1930 several constitutions were framed and never put into effect. If we glance at the Constitution of June 2, 1937,⁵ we can not but be impressed with its cum-

⁴ For the constitutional somersaults in Greece, see N. S. Kaltchas, *Introduction to the Constitutional History of Modern Greece* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), bibliography, pp. 173-176; P. Argyropoulos, "Capodistrias et la constitution de l'état hellénique" (1827-1832), "*Les Balkans*," XII (1940), pp. 1-20; and "Le reforme constitutionnelle en Grece," *Revue de sciences politiques*, LIX (1936), pp. 8-34; A. P. Couslelis, *Les Régimes gouvernementaux de la Grece de 1821 à nos jours* (Paris: Société du recueil Sirey, 1921); A. C. Djiros, *L'organisation politique de la Grece d'après la constitution républicaine du 29 Septembre 1925* (Paris: Les Presses Modernes, 1927); P. J. Pappasoteriou, *Greece Back to Democracy* (New York: Hermes Publishing Co., 1928), pp. 165-173; Herbert F. Wright, *The Constitutions of the States at War 1914-1918* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 261-262.

⁵ English text in Pappasoteriou, *op. cit.*, pp. 207-251; a summary also in *The Near East Year Book 1931-32*, pp. 310-318; *European Economic and Political Survey*, July 15, 1927, pp. 709-714; a summary with comments can be found in W. Miller, *Greece* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), Chapter XV, "The New Greek Constitution of 1927," pp. 309-324.

bersomeness, lack of organization throughout, the overlapping of various provisions, and rather futile attempts to regulate matters which should really be left to ordinary legislation. The wording and general plan is poor, so that no less than twenty interpretative declarations accompanied the original document. The attempt to imitate the Western ways of constitutionalism was to prove to be just another failure.

The four temporary constitutions introduced during the war of independence already showed that all these documents had no roots in the Greek political soil. During the monarchical period of 91 years, Greece experienced three constitutions, one for every generation—in 1844, 1864 and 1911. The violent changes of the Greek regime after World War I resulted in the Constitution of 1927 which borrowed heavily from French and British doctrines and favored a true parliamentary democracy. But the system did not work. The senate and the chamber constantly fought over the question of apportionment of power. In short, the Greek constitutions have, in the past as well as in most recent times, proved to be really footballs for the use of politicians, who bent the constitutional provisions to their own will, or disregarded the documents entirely.

THE GREEK CHARACTER

The Greek is strongly interested in politics. He has a long political tradition and is often absorbed by the glorious past of his country instead of striving to improve the present or the future. The uncultivated Greek is as violent in his prejudices, as eloquent, vehement and vainglorious in his speech, as inconclusive in his arguments, and unpractical as were his ancestors. He mistakes oratory for statesmanship, and is a shallow, noisy politician, although his patriotism, however blatant, is genuine. Every coffee-house in Athens has its own group of politicians who settle the problems of Greece and of the world nightly.⁶

The fluent, flexible, and subtle manner of the Greek does not inspire full confidence, although the Greek is even more engaging and hospitable than the Serbian. He is polite, courteous,

⁶ See: H. P. Fairchild, *Immigrant Background* (New York: Wiley, 1927), "The Greeks," pp. 58-70; F. P. Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States*, (New Haven: Yale, 1911), Ch. II, "National Character," pp. 12-51; E. S. Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization* (Los Angeles: J. S. Miller, 1923), p. 207.

and hospitable, although quite excitable, passionate, quick-tempered, familiar, obsequious, and a gambler by nature. Each Greek is an individualist, fighting for himself and not for his side. If the game goes against him, he loses his temper. Individualism makes him courageous and daring, but he does not act well with other people. In addition, no nation has ever been more closely identified with its Church than have the Greeks.

The Greek is renowned for his business ability and for bargaining. He is by instinct a trader, but at the same time a fervent patriot. Hence the Greek has often shown indomitable courage and great fighting capacity. This was proved again recently by the Albanian campaign. He can be a pleasant and joyous comrade; but he can also show ruthlessness. He is courageous, energetic and lively of mind and has physical virility, in addition to being vivacious and intelligent, apt in the acquirement of knowledge, and quick to see the practical application of what he learns. He is more active and highly strung, more spry and ardent than the Turk, both in mind and body. Hence, he is capable of more extraordinary achievements. But he is less able to bear privations, being accustomed to a more refined style of living. Music and dancing play a large part in the recreation of the Greek. Holidays and religious celebrations occupy a large place in Greek social life.

Often the brilliancy of the Greek's marks of distinction are only on the surface, solid background being frequently missing. In that case the superficiality is reflected in the striving for display, academic titles and titled positions. He is a great talker, and is often very fond of uniforms. The Greek, many times, is democratic in a political but not in a social way. There is public sentiment in Greece about everything, and this sentiment flies to attack whatever seems to offer most resistance. For this reason no dictator lasts long.

The Greek exhibits great patriotism, which makes him most enthusiastic to pursue national ideals and goals. But he is and always has been very clannish. He considers himself first of all a Cretan or Mainotes or Agraphiotes. The people of different regions display very real distinctions of character, disposition, and mode of speech. The reason for this can be traced partly to the peculiarities of Greek geography. The country has a deeply indented coastline and a mainland divided into valleys by rugged ranges. The valleys are isolated from one another, as well as

from the islands, which form a large part of the Greek territory. Consequently, in the past, Greece has been made up of independent communities of valley or island folk, really foreign to each other, although united by a common culture and civilization. The intense local patriotism of the Greeks is reflected in their political relations. They are less gregarious and generous and more independent and self-sufficient than some of the neighboring peoples.

THE CITY-VILLAGE CONFLICT

In contrast to Bulgaria, village masses are more neglected in Greece, and there is more illiteracy. The chasm between the intellectual and wealthy on the one hand, and the poorer people, on the other, is deep. Urban social conditions are, in general, similar to those in other cities in Europe. It is safe to assume that the larger the city the more cosmopolitan it is apt to be. The upper classes there have adopted an entirely European manner of living. The arrogance and superiority of the educated, privileged minority in the cities in respect to the ignorant, downtrodden and neglected peasantry is quite evident. In addition, wealth and rhetorical and literary accomplishments have a greater attraction than science.

The gap between the city and the village is also deepened by the peculiarities of the Greek language. The difference between the spoken and the written language, which appeared in the sixth century, still persists. The *Katharevousa*—a mixture of the classical and the popular language—is used in official, scientific, and legal documents and in the more formal articles of the newspapers. However, it is now gradually losing ground. The spoken and popular language—*Demotiki*—is now used by most authors for all kinds of literature. Yet the fact remains that the uneducated Greek cannot understand the high Greek, while the educated understands both. Instruction of the peasant, consequently, is practically in a foreign language.

PUBLIC OPINION

But these disabilities do not prevent a tremendous popular interest in newspapers. Although Athens has a population of

only some 453,000, it has more daily papers than New York City. It is quite common for someone knowing the classical to read the news aloud to a group of anxious listeners. The papers are primarily political sheets, as politics is the all-engrossing interest of the readers. Next to internal politics, foreign politics form the chief staple of the press. Athens is flooded with newspapers full of vitriolic denunciations of various public personages.

Just as in the villages, the centrum of political discussions is found in the ubiquitous coffee-house. It is an open-air institution and "in Hellas, it is the natural rendezvous for social intercourse and business transactions as well. Women are seldom seen there, either as proprietors, waitresses, or customers. It is the man's club, and, as such, it is a pivotal influence in the daily existence of the inhabitants."⁷ There the Greek who cannot afford to buy his favorite newspaper finds a chance to read and discuss his opinions with his acquaintances, spread rumors and learn further about the political situation.

The willingness of the Greeks to spend most of their time on politics is given powerful support by the institution of holidays and especially of "name-days." Every saint has his day, and persons named after him must keep their "name-day." As a result, on popular saint days, industry and business practically stop, and political arguments reign supreme.

PARTY CHARACTER

The Greek political parties stress primarily the influence of the political leaders, and only secondarily, if at all, the party programs and ideology. The different and numerous political groups are constituted not so much by any definite principle or principles as by the personal influence of the political leaders. The various political parties usually designate themselves, or at least the factions of the major groups, by the names of their heads, being in the main without a settled party program. Women seem to be disinterested in politics. In the Greek municipal elections of February 11, 1934, in which women voted for the first time, although there were 80,000 of them on the register in the Athens district, no more than 2,655 went to the polls.

The personal character of Greek politics is identified with the

⁷ E. G. Mears, *Greece Today* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1929), p. 45.

well-known dislike of the Greek for discipline and organization. Politics is an open career and appeals intensely to Greek tastes. But while docile to outside control, the Greek is extremely individualistic. It is frequently believed that his extreme individualism disinclines him to personal or organized social control, and that consequently he cannot adapt himself to a democracy. It is also said that a Greek would fight for a national or political cause but never for a political institution. Altogether the Greek is loyal to his own ideals and not to his party. The moment the Greek's ideal changes, he shifts to another party, and the practical result is an endless variety of leaders, factions, and coalitions. The political line-up frequently shifts from day to day, and almost from hour to hour.⁸ The government is a whirligig. Instead of parliamentary government, Greece groans under "bossism."

As the parties are based more on men than on programs and measures, their bases and activities are bound to crumble away with personal likes, dislikes, prejudices, emotions and changeable convictions. Defections are common, and deputies make their terms with the party chiefs. No well-organized caucuses exist, and the government can count on securing a majority by official pressure at the election only occasionally. Elections are often free, and the government now and then is turned out by the electorate, but more frequently it is changed by a *coup d'état*. This instability has retarded useful legislation and markedly checked national progress. The rapid tempo of political life is closely related to the frequent somersaults of Greek "public opinion," which shifts rapidly from one extreme to another, as exemplified by the oscillation of popular support between Venizelos and the King in the period after World War I.

The Greek politician, following the old principle of politics, is always more "anti" than "for," and is always ready to start a new party. Proportional representation, introduced in 1926 and applied again in 1932, further favored this tendency toward the ephemeral organization of political parties. The consequent reshuffling of governmental combinations is frequent. In 1922 Greece had seven governments under six different Prime Ministers. This instability is of course conditioned by general political developments. The wars carried on by Greece from 1912

⁸ For an able description see: H. Morgenthau, *I Was Sent to Athens* (Garden City: Doubleday Doran, 1929), Ch. XVI, "The Greatness of the Greeks," pp. 288-301.

to 1923 created economic and psychological exhaustion. The defeat in the Asia Minor venture, the social and economic disturbances coming on the heels of the Lausanne settlement of 1923, and the repatriation of the Greek refugees from Asia Minor produced the situation conducive to forceful and recurring change in politics.

During parliamentary elections the whole country is in a state of unrest, with Athens as the center of disturbance and excitement. From time to time official positions come to be looked upon as weapons for avenging injuries. As grievances and the desire to avenge them are rapidly created, vengeance provides a primary political objective. Occasionally this makes changes of opinion more rapid and emphatic. For example, a few months after Venizelos had been solemnly acclaimed the savior of his country by Parliament and all the municipalities of old and new Greece, two-thirds of the nation turned against him and recalled his royal enemy.⁹ The execution of the "Six" in 1922 embittered the atmosphere of Greek politics and pointed the way to the use of arms and the practice of exiling the opponent.

In fact, the armed forces are inextricably, even if sometimes indirectly, mixed up with politics. The army and the navy have grown accustomed since 1909 to using their influence and the brute force at their command for making and unmaking governments. The dictatorship of General Pangalos set a bad example for ambitious or discontented officers. The dictatorship of General Plastiras in 1923 was but a reflection of the trend of affairs. Generals enjoy a prestige in public life that few civilians have attained. No Greek can think of politics without thinking of the military men. It is quite natural that the generals have become leaders of political parties and that they have continued applying military methods. On the other hand, the civilian politicians are not exactly blameless for such practices. Venizelos blazed a trail for revolutionary methods when he set up his revolutionary government in Salonica in 1916. From then on he tried from time to time to salvage his political fortunes by threatening to use force and by occasionally adopting unconstitutional methods.

⁹ According to one editorial, "How They Do It in Greece," in the *Nation and Athenaeum* (London: Aug. 28, 1926), p. 604, one of the less known reasons for the overthrow of Venizelos was that Venizelos had passed the laws against cruelty to animals and so earned the opposition of the peasants.

THE PROFESSIONAL POLITICIAN

The most profitable part of the political game is played by a minority of professional politicians, except for the occasional interventions of the army and navy. The masses of the Greek people, especially the peasants, stand aside and pay the bill for political excesses and experiments. Most of the intelligentsia join politics in search of a livelihood. Consequently political contests and changes are accompanied by bitter and emotional struggles, corruption, a spoils system, waste of public funds, and results that have satisfied no one. Possibly because the strongest allurements of political allegiance is a political appointment, bureaucracy is quite an expensive proposition for the nation. Strange to say, however, most of the Cabinet Ministers have lived and died poor. This can be partly explained by the fact that elections are costly affairs and that a rich man is expected to spend freely.¹⁰

The influence of local particularism must be appreciated. There are no central party associations to keep a recalcitrant member in order by working on his local committee, and no "whip" to keep him in line in Parliament. Furthermore, there is a tendency to favor a man of old family as a party leader. The younger men find it extremely difficult to force their way to the front. The politician with a historic name is not easily displaced, the sentiment in favor of him introducing a certain conservative element into political life. We can cite in this connection the names of Venizelos and Zaimis.

UNDERCURRENTS

The picture of confused disorganization presented by the Greek political parties must not, however, obscure the fact that there can be discerned several lines of cleavage which separate groups of parties from the others. In the period of Greek politics since about 1910, a line has been roughly drawn between the old

¹⁰ According to: Great Britain, Admiralty, Geographical Section of the Naval Intelligence Division, *A Handbook of Greece* (London, 1920), vol. I p. 96, "One of the most costly claims upon a political candidate is the duty of standing godfather to the children of constituents, every godchild costing him from 30 to 50 drachma at least."

parties and the party of Venizelos. During World War I the differences between the King and Venizelos were the dominant issues. For some time thereafter all other problems were subsidiary to the conflict revolving about the personality of Venizelos. We can also discern a marked line between the more vigorous, energetic and progressive refugees settled in the annexed northern parts of Greece and those who have inhabited "old Greece" for more than two millennia. Then there are contests between the provinces and Athens for the favors of the state, and those between the ignorant, neglected and downtrodden peasant and the dominant bourgeois minority.

If compared to his Bulgarian and Romanian prototype, the Greek peasant has had little chance to assume the governmental powers and demonstrate either his ability or inability as a Cabinet member. Moreover the main question agitating the politics of Greece has been different from the key issues in the other Balkan countries. The main issue in Greece may be summed up as follows: "Republic or Kingdom?"

The republican regime of Greece presented many weak points. The Greek people are really monarchists at heart. Moreover the country has no supply of elder statesmen to draw upon to fill in regular succession the post of President. When Greece abandoned the monarchy, she had to accept autocratic rule as an escape from the logical consequences of republicanism. Thus in turn General Pangalos, Venizelos, and General Plastiras stepped in to supply the country with someone whose prestige would transcend that of the ordinary political leader.

TRENDS IN POLITICS

Modern Greek politics has passed through five definite cycles.¹¹ For forty years the political arena was dominated by the towering figure of Eleutherios Venizelos. The internal division brought about by him was unbridgeable up to 1936, regardless of whether he was on the scene or in exile, in the forefront or the background. The second cycle was marked by the restoration of the monarchy. It was soon followed by the third, the establishment of an authoritarian dictatorship, and then by the

¹¹ Joseph S. Roucek, *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939), p. 104.

Nazi conquest. With the return of the Greek exiled government to liberated Athens the present period began.

Venizelos (1864-1936) reached the Premiership of Greece seven times after he had first assumed the position in 1910. He was one of the few European statesmen prominent before and after World War I. A fiery revolutionist, an extreme nationalist, an adroit statesman and politician, Venizelos was in no small way responsible for the crumbling of thrones and the shaping of modern Greek history. Most of his life was devoted to the ideal of "Greece for the Greeks."

Born in a hamlet outside of Canea, the capital of Crete, he was given the prophetic name of Eleutherios-Zeus, the Deliverer. After studying law in Athens, intoxicated by theories of nationalism and Pan-Hellenism, he joined the revolutionaries of Crete in their struggle against the Turks.¹² He was the soul of the successful revolution of 1906. His great opportunity came in 1909. The military league overthrew the government; their leaders looked for a "New Deal" man, and turned to the young fire-eater from Crete. In September, 1910, Venizelos was made Prime Minister. His Liberal Party made an auspicious start. By 1912 Greece was in a position to participate in the Balkan Wars. He also led Greece into World War I on the Allied side in 1916. At this time he came into conflict with the dynasty and won the contest.

Greece and World War I. Almost from the day World War I began Greece was a center of political intrigues by the Great Powers. King Constantine, his eldest son, George, and his Chief of Staff, John Metaxas, were accused by the Allies of being pro-German. In 1915 the Allies landed troops in Salonica in an ill-starred attempt to save Serbia; in 1916 they shelled Athens to make the Greeks give up their arms; in 1917 they almost starved Greece to force her into the war.

Royal Changes. Against this pressure and against the "quiescent" tactics of Venizelos (whom the King had deposed as Premier for conniving with the Allies in the Salonica adventure), Constantine could not hold out. In June, 1917 he fled the country with the Queen and Crown Prince George. Meanwhile Veni-

¹² Cf. A. T. Polyzoides, "Venizelos of Greece," *World Affairs Interpreter*, VII (1936), pp. 14-22; Count C. Sforza, *Makers of Modern Europe* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1930), pp. 164-182.

zelos returned from exile and declared Greece's entrance into the war.

The Allies set up Constantine's second son, Alexander, as a puppet king, with Venizelos as the country's strong man. This arrangement worked well until Alexander died in October 1920 of a monkey bite. The next month the Greeks went to the polls and expressed three years of resentment against Venizelos by overthrowing the government. In a plebiscite on Constantine's return, huge and genial "Tino" received a large majority of the eligible vote. He returned to Athens at the end of 1920, inheriting a war against the Turks.

He stayed less than two years. France and Britain refused to recognize him. He was blamed for the debacle at Smyrna, and after a demonstration led by Colonel Nicholas Plastiras in 1922, he again abdicated. His son George, who remained in office just fifteen months, succeeded him. Venizelos, recalled to salvage what he could at Lausanne from the Turkish imbroglio, could not get along with him. As a result, the country soon split into two camps, Venizelists (i.e., Republicans) and Monarchists. In December 1923, after a Venizelist victory at the polls, George and his Queen, Elizabeth of Romania, were asked to leave the country while Parliament decided on the future form of government. On March 25, 1924, the 103rd anniversary of the Greek declaration of independence, Parliament proclaimed a republic.

The Republican Interlude. The revolution of 1922 had brought to a head the underlying difference between Monarchists and Republicans. In the long and ferocious war that ensued Venizelos became the symbol of fratricidal strife. The Royalists formed the new National Party (later renamed Popular Party), an organization without a social program of its own, except for its opposition to Venizelos. Its wheel-horses were mostly prewar politicians whom Venizelos had deposed and who were eager to repay him in his own coin. Then the disastrous Turkish War led to the execution of the "Six" Royalists, which left an indelible mark on Greek politics. Thereafter the Monarchists were in public disfavor. Their policy was commonly identified with the loss of Asia Minor and East Thrace and the expulsion of the Greek population from Turkey. Consequently the plebiscite of April 13, 1924, decided in favor of the Republic.

By 1928 Greece was thoroughly tired of factional strife, attempts at dictatorship, drachma depreciation, and refugee loans.

Venizelos was carried by another wave of popularity into the Premiership with his Liberal Party. Whether in or out of power, he dominated the political scene up to 1932. At this date the elections went against him, and the Popular Party with its Royalist leader, Tsaldaris, who promised to uphold the republican form of government, came into power. Venizelos, who had served as Premier ten times altogether, was ousted by the Royalist Party. He went to Paris in 1935 and died there a year later.

GEORGE II

Between 1923 and 1935 there were 25 Greek administrations, with two dictatorships (one for 14 months under General Pangalos, the other for 14 hours under General Plastiras). In October 1935 an army coup established General George ("The Thunderbolt") Kondylis as Premier and Regent. The republican Constitution was abolished and the monarchy restored. After much international political manipulation, George II was invited to replace his British bowler with the diadem of his forefathers.

This twice-enthroned son of a twice-elected father had been bored by his twelve years of exile. In London, where he lived most of the time, he had become accustomed to the privileged but democratic life of small-time royalty. The Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Glücksburg family, which ascended the Greek throne in 1863, had the easygoing habits of all Danes. George had served in Uncle William Hohenzollern's Prussian Guards for a time, and had fought in the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913. In 1913 Grandfather George was assassinated and Father Constantine became King. By 1917 George was a major of infantry and commander in the Greek Navy. However, his father's abdication kept him from doing anything in World War I. For the next 18 years (except for his brief puppet reign in 1922-1923) he was out of a job.

But in 1935 George suddenly found himself internationally important. Italy's man in Greece was the old Thunderer, George Kondylis, who was serving as War Minister. George became Britain's man. The Premier at the time was Panagiotis Tsaldaris. George's family had given a banquet at Bled, Yugoslavia, for Premier Tsaldaris, who went into dinner a republican, and returned a royalist. Tsaldaris then helped to rig the plebiscite that

recalled George by a 98 per cent vote. He set foot on Greek soil on November 25, 1935. Athens was decorated with arches on which republican youths spattered ink. On the other hand, the royalist youths contributed money to buy the King a royal bed.

When the shouting was over, Greece was in just as serious a political plight as ever. Kondylis wanted to be a Duce; George wanted to be a real King. He dismissed Kondylis (who soon after died) and called for a free election. Unfortunately, the elections only made things worse. Venizelists and anti-Venizelists were almost evenly divided and, consequently, the balance of power in the new Parliament was held by 15 Communists. Thereupon George called upon War Minister John Metaxas (whose party held seven seats) to form a government. Metaxas did. To avoid a test vote, he persuaded the King to dissolve Parliament. The following day Metaxas reorganized the Cabinet, abolished political parties and imposed a strict censorship. In 1938 he made himself Premier for life.

"Little John" was not popular in Greece at first. His government was neither a constitutional monarchy nor a corporative state, but it had the fascist elements of regimentation, government by decree, secret police and a youth movement. (There were no civil liberties, but cigarettes were cheap and every man could afford a string of beads to twiddle in his idle fingers.) Metaxas was Premier, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Cults and National Education, Minister of War, Minister of Marine and Air Minister.

On October 28, 1940 Metaxas defiantly rejected Italy's three-hour ultimatum and addressed the Greek people in words reminiscent of the days of Byron. He had changed from being a waverer, who was pro-German in World War I, to become a stiff-backed defier of the Axis after several months of intrigue in that most intriguing country, Greece.

GREECE UNDER THE AXIS

The heroic little Greek army surprised the world by driving the invading Italian forces far back into Albania, thus forcing Germany to go to Mussolini's assistance in April, 1941. The Greeks, assisted by a small British force, were soon defeated by the Germans attacking from Bulgaria. King George and the

Cabinet withdrew to London and set up a government-in-exile.

After the fall of Greece, Bulgaria annexed eastern Macedonia and Thrace, with an area of 16,682 square kilometers and a population of 590,000. These areas were the richest tobacco-producing lands in Greece. Other areas were seized by the Albanians and by Italy. Germany occupied the Aegean Islands, with the exception of Samos, and all of Crete except its eastern tip which the Italians were allowed to hold. All that remained of Greece, which was under an army of occupation, was the mainland, Thessaly, and the Peloponnesus, with a population of 3,546,000.

The Greek people suffered the worst indignities. Their territory was divided among three invaders: the defeated Italians and the predatory Bulgars followed in the wake of Germany, occupying some of the most fertile and lovely provinces. Devastation, famine, rape and oppression were the daily portion of the Greeks.¹³

Resistance Movement. An underground movement was organized soon after the Axis occupation. It grew in strength as the tide of war turned against the Axis. Bands of guerrillas harassed the Italians and Germans from the mountains. In Athens, Salonica, and other cities resistance took the form of strikes and sabotage against the German-supported puppet government, headed first by General Tsolakoglou, who signed the armistice with the Germans in April, 1941, and then by Constantine Logothatopoulos and John Rhallis successively.

The largest and most effective of the underground organizations was the EAM, or National Liberation Front, a coalition of leftist elements operating mainly under Communist direction, with a powerful military arm called the ELAS. EAM and ELAS were strongly republican in sympathies, while another smaller but well-armed group, the EDES headed by Colonel Zervas, seemed to be pro-monarchist.¹⁴ Enmity between these groups was fanned by the Germans and, despite the efforts of British

¹³ The Greeks estimated that 200,000 of their people had died of famine during the Axis occupation; that 60,000 had been massacred by Bulgarian occupation troops and another 15,000 shot as hostages by the Germans; and that a million Greeks were suffering from tuberculosis. Fully 30 per cent of the nation's wealth as represented by shipping, railroads, factories and communications had become a total loss.

¹⁴ There were various other guerrilla groups, some seeking to establish a left-wing dictatorship along the lines of Tito's Partisans in Yugoslavia. For details, see Kimon A. Doukas, *The Resistance Movement in Greece* (unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, 1944).

liaison officers to maintain peace, civil war broke out among the guerrillas long before the end of the Axis occupation.

THE GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE

Meanwhile an anti-monarchist movement had also made its appearance among Greek troops, who were being trained in Egypt with British assistance to take part in the liberation of Greece. In an effort to ease the rising tension between monarchists and republicans, King George on July 4, 1943, announced to the Greek people that after their liberation they would be asked to decide by free vote the "institutions with which Greece must endow herself."¹⁵ The following spring George Papandreou became Premier of the government in exile in London. At his request representatives of all the Greek parties, including leaders of the chief resistance groups in Greece, met in the Lebanese Republic in May, 1944, and reached an agreement for the establishment of an all-party coalition government under Papandreou. This government was completed in August when members of the EAM and the Greek Communist party finally agreed to participate.¹⁶

In October British forces landed in Greece to assist the guerrillas in expelling the Axis armies of occupation. Athens was liberated October 13 and the Papandreou Government ended the long exile with its return to the Greek capital October 17. To avoid aggravation of the internal conflict King George remained abroad.

GREECE AFTER LIBERATION

The government and the British forces found Greece in a desperate condition, both politically and economically. The people were starved, poverty-stricken and disease-ridden from the effects of the war and the Axis occupation. Worse still, the incipient civil war between rival Greek armed guerrilla forces assumed more serious proportions. No sooner had the Germans, Italians

¹⁵ On October 22, 1941, a "Constituent Act" had been issued repealing the act of 1936 and outlining the government's constitutional prerogatives.

¹⁶ Cf. Basil Vlavianos, "Greece on the Road to Unity," *Free World*, VIII (October, 1944), pp. 355-359; Greek-American Labor Committee, *Greece Fights for Freedom!* (New York, 1944).

and Bulgarian occupation forces been removed,¹⁷ than the British found themselves playing the role of policemen between the rival Greek factions, while the Papandreou Government sought to bring order out of chaos. However efforts at bringing the rival factions together proved unavailing. The EDES were anti-Bulgarian and anti-Russian; as rightists they wanted Greece to profit from the war by annexing as much neighboring territory as possible; they wanted the nation to continue in Britain's sphere of influence and get her support for an expansionist program. The EAM, as leftists dominated by the Greek Communist party, were friendly toward Russia and concerned more with internal reforms than with territorial expansion.

Civil War. In the period of Germany's decline, no country save Poland provoked more furious inter-Allied controversy. Within the six months after its liberation, Greece had three governments and sixty-one Cabinet Ministers. The action of British troops against the Greek resistance movement during the winter of 1944-1945 split world opinion in two opposing camps—the one convinced that Britain was indeed defending the democratic cause against what Winston Churchill termed “naked, triumphant communism” and the other equally sure that Britain was defending her own imperial interests at the expense of the Greek people. But the winter's crisis ended quickly. Forty-two days after the first skirmishes in the streets of Athens opened hostilities between ELAS and the British, a truce was signed.

In the background were several factors. The leftist forces were afraid of the reactionary elements, allegedly supported by the Britishers—and especially of pro-monarchical tendencies. The alleged fears of the upper classes of Communist dictatorship and terror were more than offset by the more easily justifiable fear of the laboring classes and the petty bourgeoisie of another Fascist dictatorship of the extreme right. The British, on the other hand, were using their influence to insure the return of the monarchy. They wanted a government in Greece which would maintain friendly relations with Britain, thus safeguarding the vital Mediterranean sea lanes upon which the British depend for trade with the Middle East and the Orient. The British felt that a monarchy, even a limited one, would be “safer” than a government which

¹⁷ The Bulgarians were forced to disgorge Greek Macedonia, Thrace and the islands of Thasos and Samothrace.

might be Communist-dominated and inclined to follow the wishes of the Russians.

Regency. The Civil War ended by the installation of Archbishop Damaskinos as Regent of the country, pending a plebiscite to determine whether or not the exiled King should return to his throne. The ELAS forces were disarmed, and a new government was formed under the leadership of General Plastiras. Damaskinos held his Regency and kept his government in power only with the support of the British Army in Greece. "On their fateful visit to Athens (in December, 1944), at the height of the tragic battle between Greek and Greek, and Greek and Britain, Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden chose Damaskinos as the one Greek who might save his countrymen from themselves—and who might save Greece for Britain and the western world."¹⁸ But even with British support, Damaskinos and his Ministers had hard going. Greece was a hungry nation, in spite of the help extended by UNRRA. Inflation was on the march. The leftist EAM and its disarmed ELAS, had been vitiated, but Greeks did not forget the valor or the sins of the resistant Left. Damaskinos' Ministers often outdid the repressed Left in rigorous repression. The ever-seething question whether King George II (or any king) should take the throne embroiled Damaskinos' first choice for the Premiership, General Nicholas Plastiras, and led to his overthrow. Distrusting him, royalists published the fact that Plastiras had invited German intervention during Greece's heroic war with Italy. Into office came harassed, tubby Admiral Petros Voulgaris, commander-in-chief of the Greek fleet and a follower of Eleutherios Venizelos. Beating upon the Regent from within were minority Communists and equally vocal Rightists. And beating upon him from without was the Great Power contest for the Mediterranean. By old agreement with Churchill, the Russians officially kept hands off Britain's one remaining satellite on that shore of "Britain's sea." But Greek Communists also plagued Damaskinos' rule.

SWING TO THE RIGHT

Nowhere in Europe did World War II leave behind a more unsavory political snarl than in hungry, unhappy Greece. No-

¹⁸ "Greece," *Time*, XLVI (October 1, 1945), pp. 35-38.

where did the chances seem slighter for the people themselves to meet those issues in free, democratic elections. The Greek government appealed to the United Nations for help in preventing chaos. The United States, Britain and France accepted responsibility for supervising elections to chart Greece's future. Russia declined, saying that conditions (i.e., the presence of British troops) were lacking for free elections. The Leftist EAM charged that the Greek government was conniving with diehard royalists to stuff the ballot boxes in their favor; it angrily withdrew from the elections and ordered its followers to boycott the polls.

In contrast with the campaign's disordered violence, the election of March 31, 1946, was a model of placidity. The returns gave the Populists—conservatives with strong royalist leanings—a clear majority in the Assembly which was to serve as both a legislature and a convention to revise the 1911 Constitution. The Allied Commission for Observing the Greek Elections (AMFOGE) estimated that 60 per cent of all eligible Greek males had voted; most of the remaining 40 per cent represented a normal failure to vote. Only 9.3 per cent of the voters abstained for political reasons. The EAM's abstention, by AMFOGE estimate, had failed to affect the outcome materially. The Left instead had thrown away control of from 20 to 25 per cent of the unicameral legislature which it would have obtained under proportional representation if it had participated freely in the election. A strongly Rightist government was formed under the Populist leader, Constantin Tsaldaris.

Though Greece's problems were far from solved by this election, the Greek people had spoken eloquently against domination by a highly organized, articulate Communist minority. There was danger that the reactionary Rightists would abuse their newly achieved power. But the elections disproved the assertion constantly made by EAM and ELAS that they were the "people." They were left with no hope of becoming masters of Greece without help from abroad.

Another Return of King George. On September 1, 1946, a plebiscite was held on the return of King George II. Again Leftists charged that the plebiscite was rigged by the monarchists. Nobody thought it an ideal election, but limited Allied supervision assured a reasonably honest vote. Even in traditionally turbulent Macedonia and in Republican Crete, there was—for Greece—

practically no disorder. The result was as good as the monarchists' expectations: King George II was recalled to the throne by a four to one majority. He died April 1, 1947.

The change in Greek sentiment toward the monarchy had come about largely for two reasons. First, many Greeks had been antagonized by the excesses of the Left in the civil war. They reasoned that the King's influence would serve as a bulwark against the Communists and might improve the prospects for internal peace. Some, however, thought that the return of George II would only precipitate open civil war. Second, there was the obvious Russian sponsorship of Greece's bitter enemies in the north—Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. In Paris, the Russians gave tacit support to Bulgarian claims for part of Thrace; in New York before the United Nations Security Council the Ukrainians presented Albania's case against Greece.

The Greece to which George II had returned in 1935, after a similar plebiscite, had been superficially tranquil and prosperous under the dictatorship of General John Metaxas. The Greece to which the King returned in 1946 seethed with the hatreds raised by two years of intermittent civil war. In Northern Greece bands of Communists, reinforced from across the Albanian and Bulgarian borders, roamed the countryside and blocked the few roads which the retreating Germans had not destroyed. Fanatic royalists called Xites terrorized any peasants rash enough openly to oppose the monarchy. The efforts of the reactionary Tsaldaris Government to stamp out the republican movement provided more recruits for the largely Communist-led guerrilla bands in the north. By the beginning of 1947 this guerrilla movement had grown so powerful that the Tsaldaris Government had difficulty in coping with the situation. Meanwhile economic conditions were growing steadily worse.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The international problems facing the country were even more difficult. After her liberation from the Turks, Greece, although repeatedly at war, was never threatened with the loss of her national independence until she was attacked by Italy and Germany. When she recovered her independence in 1944, she did not recover her former relative security for the balance of power

in the Balkans, which had enabled her in the past to count on at least one Balkan Power as an ally in the event of war with another, was not restored. The German hegemony in the Balkans had passed to Russia, and Greece faced a solidly hostile coalition on her northern borders.

EAM and ELAS were the allies of Yugoslavia and Albania as well as of Bulgaria—that is to say, of Russia. It was a fifth column, an operational force engaged in an internal campaign against Greek independence, a campaign which was but part of a vast European action conducted by Russia. Just as Germany struck at Great Britain through Greece, so Russia was striking through Greece, for whatever Great Power controls Greece will, in the end, control the eastern Mediterranean. Border disputes between Greece and her three northern neighbors were but minor aspects of this vast strategic plan of Russia. Involved was the possibility that Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Albania might unite in a South Slav Federation under Soviet sponsorship. Greece charged that Albania and Yugoslavia were aiding armed bands in Greek Macedonia; Russia charged, on the other hand, that Greek troops were carrying out forays into Albania.

These three enemies of Greece tacitly backed Bulgaria's demands for Western Thrace and Yugoslavia's claims to Greek Macedonia.

The main obstacles to this expansionist program were the United States, Great Britain and the non-Slav states of Central and Southeastern Europe. In Britain, a Balkan federation was considered another Soviet pawn. Tsarist Russia had used the Pan-Slav movement and penetration of the Balkans as a means of pressure against the Turkish Empire to seek control of the Dardanelles. Britain opposed this drive throughout the nineteenth century for the same reason that she opposed it in 1946–1947. The United States was backing Britain in her efforts to keep Russia out of the Mediterranean and was also opposed to the Balkan Pan-Slav union on economic grounds. Austria, Hungary, Italy, Greece and Turkey, countries that border and almost surround the South Slav states, feared that the federation would support Moscow's efforts to bring them into the Soviet sphere.

United Nations Investigation. On Dec. 12, 1946, Premier Tsaldaris personally appeared before the United Nations Security Council at Lake Success, New York, and accused Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania of organizing and supporting

guerrilla raids into Greek territory. Warning that the "state of undeclared war" in Northern Greece was reaching an acutely dangerous stage, he requested the Council to take measures to end this situation. The Security Council responded by sending a commission to the Balkans at the end of January, 1947, to make an on-the-spot investigation of the Greek frontier crisis.

AMERICA STEPS IN

Early in 1947 Truman's government decided to consider Greece as the Number One danger problem spot of the world, due to the efforts of the Communist guerrilla bands to overthrow King George's government with the support of the pro-Soviet régimes of Albania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. The United States Congress reluctantly approved the sending of \$300,000,000 worth of military and economic assistance on the basis of the so-called Truman Doctrine. Britain, which had forced this decision due to its announcement that she was unable to carry the burden of keeping up her forces in Greece, expected to stay there as a junior partner, paying her way with advice, not money.

RECENT TRENDS

A race between American help and the growing internal political and economic chaos was under way immediately. Both the guerrillas and the government used terrorism. While all the rightist parties of Greece opposed Communism, all the chief politicians were trying to win the honor of leading the crusade against the leftists. Drought and civil war led to a 30 per cent drop in the grain harvest from 1946's to 1,223,000 tons.

The formation of various Cabinets was always accompanied with bitterness and difficulties, the representatives of the United States and Great Britain usually pressing for the broadening of the base of the Cabinet. Upon his return from New York, Tsaldaris was forced to resign; The Maximos government, formed on January 27, 1947, included six of the seven parties represented in Parliament. Maximos, a Populist and former governor of the Bank of Greece, retained Tsaldaris as Foreign Minister. Maximos' efforts to appease the guerrilla forces were

useless. In fact, on August 16, Markos Vafiadis, the guerrilla leader assumed, in a broadcast, all authority for a "democratic government" until a provisional government had been formed in the northern area, abolished the royal dynasty of Klückbourg and "dethroned" King Paul (who succeeded his brother, King George, on his passing on April 1). The Cabinet faced another crisis in August, when the government finally resigned over the question whether the Communist party should be declared illegal; difficult negotiations, under the pressure of the American representatives for a broader popular governmental representation, produced, on September 7, 1947, the coalition government of Liberals and Populists with Themistocles Sophoulis as Premier and Tsaldaris as Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister. The government offered an unconditional amnesty to the rebels—and met with a miserable response. Athens had to urge the American Mission to give priority to the military phase of the aid program in order to permit expansion of the Greek army from 130,000 to 200,000. In December, 1947, Markos Vafiadis (1906—), "General Markos," a former laborer in Constantinople, a convert to Communism who had made a career of violent political agitation, proclaimed a Communist state in northern Greece. The British Foreign Office immediately warned that any nation's recognition of this guerrilla government would signalize "a grave deterioration in the international situation."

International Implications. Truman's plan of American help was broadcast while a Balkan Commission of the United Nations investigated guerrilla activities in northern Greece. Its report to the United Nations Security Council on June 25, 1947, showed that Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania had lent their support to the anti-government guerrillas. The Commission recommended by 9 to 2 votes that a semi-permanent group should keep an eye on northern Greece from Salonica; the Soviet Union tried to block the creation of such a commission through a series of vetoes—and the satellites dared its members to try to step on their territories.

By the turn of 1948, it was evident that the United States would have to decide very soon whether to get deeper into Greece's affairs or get out entirely. Inflation was climbing up, the military situation was worsening, and the economic reconstruction was slowing down as men and money had to be diverted to expanding the Greek army. Political quarrels within the Greek

government were hampering action, the rival Populists and Liberals more interested in feuding than in saving their country. Hordes of refugees from the war areas were crowding into the cities, and the feeding of this mob of more than 300,000 was a heavy burden for the poverty-stricken government.

The United States was dragged more and more into the involved situation in spite of her reluctance. It was obvious that Communist victory in Greece would eliminate Turkey from its position as a counterforce to Soviet Russia's expansion into the Mediterranean, and thus weaken America's strategic position in the Middle East, where the United States has heavy interests in oil. More United States Marines were sent to join the aircraft carrier *Midway*; the cruisers *Little Rock*, *Providence*, and *Portsmouth*, plus ten destroyers, were located strategically in the Mediterranean sea. United States military advisers were increased in numbers.

The "cold war" between Soviet Russia and the United States found its most important testing ground in Greece and the Mediterranean. And it might not be amiss to note that "not only the concept of democracy but also the Trojan Horse technique originated on the ancient, blood-drenched soil of Greece."¹⁹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BAIRD, H. M., *Modern Greece* (New York: Harper, 1856). A narrative of residence and travel in Greece with observations on political and religious life.
- BLACK, E. C., "The Greek Crisis—Its Constitutional Background," *Review of Politics*, X (January, 1948), pp. 84-99. Valuable bibliographical footnotes.
- CASSON, STANLEY, *Greece Against the Axis* (Washington, D. C.: American Council of Public Affairs, 1943). On the sufferings of Greece during the Axis occupation.
- FENTON, EDWARD B., *The Double Darkness* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1947). A British soldier becomes a part of a Greek partisan movement.
- HADSEL, WINIFRED H., "American Policy Toward Greece," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XXIII: 12 (1947).
- KING, WILLIAM B., and O'BRIEN, FRANK, *The Balkans* (New York: Knopf, 1947).

¹⁹ Martin Ebon, *World Communism Today* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1948), p. 149.

- LEVANDIS, J. A., *The Greek Foreign Debt and the Great Powers, 1821-1898* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944). Scholarly.
- MAVROGORDATO, JOHN, *Modern Greece* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931). A good introduction.
- MCNEILL, W. H., *The Greek Dilemma: War and Aftermath* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1947). Probably the best available study of affairs and personalities of contemporary Greece.
- MEARS, E. G., *Greece Today* (Stanford University Press, 1929). An excellent survey, with emphasis on economic questions.
- MILLER, WALTER, *Greece and the Greeks* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941). A survey of Greek civilization.
- MILLER, WILLIAM, *Greece* (New York: Scribner's, 1928). One of the best historical accounts in English.
- ROUCEK, JOSEPH S., "Greece," Chapter VI, pp. 99-117, in *The Politics of the Balkans* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939).
- WALKER, A. H., *A Primer of Greek Constitutional History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1902).
- WALKER, DAVID, *The Greek Miracle* (New York: Hastings House, 1942). Details on the Axis attack on Greece.

TURKEY

At one time the Turkish Empire included most of southeastern Asia and northern Africa, and extended to the very gates of Vienna. Even as late as 1913 Turkey had an area of more than 700,000 square miles and a population of over 21,000,000. Modern Turkey has an area of 296,502 square miles and a population numbering 18,871,000 at the 1945 census. Only a little larger than the State of Texas, Turkey has always been of great interest to the great Powers. For she sits on the Dardanelles, and these Straits, together with the Sea of Marmora and the Bosphorus, constitute the vital sea connection between the Black and Aegean Seas. They command the bottleneck connecting Europe and Asia.¹

When Great Britain decided, in March, 1947, to give up helping Greece and Turkey, the age-old problem of the Dardanelles was back. United States' aid was needed to bolster Turkish resistance against Soviet Russia's demands for a "share" in the defense of the Straits—meaning Soviet military bases along the Dardanelles—otherwise, the Russian orbit would reach to the Mediterranean, and its expansion in this direction might thus extend to Italy and France. If so, the spread of Communism could not possibly be stopped at all in Europe and the Near East.

GEOPOLITICS

In both World Wars Turkey figured large in the plans of German geopoliticians. *Geopolitik*, from one point of view, was but a Nazi continuation and an extension of the German Kaiser's dream of *Drang nach Osten*.² The Berlin-to-Bagdad Railroad

¹ Joseph S. Roucek, "Southeastern Europe—Study in Geographic Disunity," Chapter XXI, pp. 545-560, in George T. Renner, *Global Geography* (New York: Crowell, 1944).

² Cf. Joseph S. Roucek, "Geopolitics, Imperialism, and War," Chapter XVII, pp. 339-365, in T. V. Kalijarvi, Ed., *Modern World Politics* (New York: Crowell, 1945).

(really from Constantinople to the mouth of the Persian Gulf), which the Germans began working on in 1888 and left four-sevenths completed in 1914, was intended to make Kaiser Wilhelm II's dream come true. It was to bind together a German system of economic and political alliances, opening a broad path southeast across Europe and Asia Minor dominated by the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Turkish Empires. Such a railway would have given Germany an outlet on the Persian Gulf close to India. If achieved, it might have helped eventually to break Great Britain's power in Asia, to erect a German Empire based on the "Transversal Eurasian Axis" from Hamburg to Basra on the Persian Gulf—the shortest land route between the Atlantic Ocean (North Sea) and the Indian Ocean (Persian Gulf). Hegemony over this gateway to the Orient meant for the Kaiser, as well as for Hitler, that Great Britain and France would become second-rate Powers and Germany the greatest empire on the globe.

It was the contention of the Kaiser's "brain trusters" that the British Empire could be attacked and mortally wounded in the Near East—through Turkey. That sounded good to the Kaiser; it also sounded good to Hitler whose ideas, formulated partly at least by Haushofer, followed the line of reasoning provided by the Kaiser's advisers. The Kaiser almost got what he wanted. In 1943, his successor, Adolf Hitler nearly reached the end of his rainbow. Turkey paid the price of defeat in 1918 when she was attached to Germany's kite. But the fortunes of global war saved her in World War II during which she maintained a pro-Allied neutrality. Many observers felt that Hitler's unwillingness to follow up his success in Greece by invading the Near East through the Dardanelles and Turkey was one of the first steps in his failure to achieve the "Transversal Eurasian Axis." In other words, the retention of the Straits by Turkey was one of the decisive factors which spelled victory in World War II for Russia as well as for the Allied armies in the Near East and Africa.

But the end of World War II did not do away with the strategic importance of Turkey and the Dardanelles. Russia started almost immediately to increase her pressure on Turkey and Greece in an attempt to get into the Mediterranean. Her demands for the control of the Dardanelles, opposed by Britain and the United States, meant another cycle of political maneuvering for domination of an area considered vital to all major Powers.

Economic Background. The territory of Turkey today consists

mainly of the former province of Anatolia or Asia Minor, the centrum of old Turkey. European Turkey comprises only 3.15 per cent of the whole national territory. Asiatic Turkey is, on the whole, a high plateau sinking on all sides except the east. On the southeast it merges into a region of wooded foothills and flat alluvial plains. Eastward the plateau tends to rise in height and change into mountainous country. Thrace, or Turkey in Europe, is a continuation of the foothills to the northwest, with the Bosphorus depression intervening to allow the accumulated waters of the Black Sea to pass. There are no rivers of commercial importance. In fact, many of the streams are really great malaria-breeding swamps, though the rivers in Asia Minor are important for irrigation and producing power. On the whole, the landscape of Anatolia varies little, with mountains, valleys, and plateaus comprising the main part. Along the Turkish coast the summers are hot and dry; the winters, cool, relatively wet, and typically Mediterranean. The interior has the continental type of climate, hot in summer and cold in winter, with some rain falling at all times of the year.

Economics. Of the total area of Turkey only about 30 per cent is now arable.³ The foundation of Turkey's economic existence is agriculture, although less than five per cent of the total area is under cultivation. In 1937 a four-year agricultural plan was formulated; the plan included a more intensive cultivation of cotton and tobacco, important irrigation schemes and the appointment of agricultural experts to supervise modern methods of cultivation throughout the whole country. In addition to other measures, agriculture has been financially assisted by the Agricultural Bank and by the abolition of the tithe. Even military service has been reduced for the peasants and those serving in the army are permitted to work in the fields.

But in spite of the tremendous efforts made by the Turkish Government to improve the standards of agriculture, much remains to be done. The primitive method of plowing with a metal-tipped stick and the disinclination of the peasants to use artificial fertilizers and manures is complicated by inadequacy of communications and by the disorganization caused by the

³ Cf. République Turque, Présidence du Conseil, Office Central du Statistique, *Annuaire Turquie Nouvelle* (Ankara, 1933); R. P. D. Stephen Taylor, Ed., *Handbook of Central and East Europe 1937* (Zurich: The Central European Times Publishing Co., 1937), pp. 773-886.

exodus of Greek and Armenian nationals and the coming of Turkish refugees from Greece. Dependent as Turkey has been on the sale of a number of agricultural products abroad, it has been inevitable that she should be keenly affected by the slump which descended on the world in and after 1929. Until the opening of World War II, the low, unremunerative prices for tobacco and other commodities impoverished the peasants and greatly diminished purchasing power throughout Turkey.

It is believed that Turkey has a large mineral wealth; but its extent is not exactly known. Transportation and communication are still very inadequate. Roads are few, and, in general, in poor condition. The principal means of transportation are still horse-drawn carriages and wagons, oxen and water-buffalo carts, pack-horses, donkey trains, and the disappearing camel caravans. In winter most of the roads are impassable. In no direction has the systematic development of the country, which figured in the forefront of the government's program, achieved more conspicuous results than in that of railway construction. The best harbor is Istanbul. Smyrna is the principal export shipping point of Anatolia. Commerce, in general, is under state control. The numerous state monopolies exclude private enterprise.

Social Conditions. The most important social factor of Turkey is the rapid transition from the Oriental type of civilization to that of the Occident. In 1933 the Republic of Turkey celebrated the tenth anniversary of its formation; this short decade had sufficed to raise the country and its people out of the rut of medievalism and transform the "Sick Man of Europe" into a progressive modern state. Fortunately also, Turkey has been the only defeated state which has had no serious foreign grievances and which has concentrated its efforts on its internal affairs instead of shedding tears over lost territory.

The population of Turkey has increased from 13,640,000 in 1927 to 16,200,200 in 1935 and 18,871,000 in 1945. The agricultural and pastoral occupation predominates. There is a wide gap between the standards of the cities and those of the peasant villages. At one extreme stands Istanbul with all the modern innovations; at the other, the Anatolian villages which lack nearly all modern conveniences.

Possibly the most serious problem presented to the Government has been that of education. In 1927, 91.84 per cent of the population was illiterate. But far-reaching changes have taken

place. In 1924, all religious schools, and theological seminaries (*Medreseh*) were closed. In 1928 the new Turkish alphabet based on Latin characters was adopted. Special courses in the new alphabet for illiterates were organized. Every year the number of people who are able to read and write is increasing. Elementary education is compulsory and free in government schools.

In some districts travelling teachers are employed. Since 1923 ten new training colleges have been built, including one for music and one for physical training. They are all free boarding schools. In all Turkish schools co-education is general. Sports have been greatly developed in recent years. The University at Istanbul was reorganized in 1933. Adult education has been one of the greatest movements in Turkey. Since the adoption of the new alphabet more than 3,000,000 people have learned to read and write.

Perhaps the most far-reaching of all the innovations of the new regime has been the emancipation of women. The adoption of the Swiss code on October 4, 1926, prohibited polygamy. A constitutional revision of 1934 permitted women to vote. Thus the dependence and inferiority of women were legally ended.⁴

There is also the problem of some 388,000 Turkish refugees who were transferred from Greece under the Convention of 1923.⁵ Turkey found sufficient room for them to settle, but was handicapped by a lack of financial resources. In fact, the expulsion of the Greeks has been a serious economic and social loss to Turkey—although a priceless political gain considering the troubles which the minorities in Europe have always caused. Some industries, such as the carpet industry, fig packing, the olive industry, etc., were ruined permanently, and the business and trading abilities of the Greeks can hardly be replaced by the inexperienced Turks.

⁴ Grace Blakemore, "Turkish Women Step Forward," *Social Science*, VI (July, 1931), pp. 299-303; Charles Pound, "Turkish Women Still Striding Forward," *New York Times Magazine* (April 16, 1933); Rosita Forbes, *Conflict* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1931). The best known Turkish woman is Knum Halidah Adib; see her *The Turkish Ordeal* (New York: Century, 1928); *Turkey Faces West* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930); "Woman's Part in Turkey's Progress," in *The Open Court*, XLVI (May, 1932), pp. 343-360; Chester M. Tobin, *Turkey, Key to the East* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1944).

⁵ Cf. Stephen P. Ladas, *The Exchange of Minorities, Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), Part II, p. 335 ff.

NATIONAL, RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION

One of the chief difficulties confronting Turkey in the past was the presence of a large number of various minorities within the Ottoman Empire. To the ethnic differences of the Turkish subjects were added those of religion, language, and character. The constant friction arising out of their existence within the Empire was ample justification for the European Powers to interfere in the internal affairs of the Turkish Empire.

The Kemalists were determined to solve this problem once and for all, and Ankara's policy has been consistently in the direction of eliminating all disturbing minorities. The Treaty of Sèvres of 1920 provided for the protection of minorities. However, it never came into force. The Treaty of Lausanne also provided for the protection of Turkish minorities; but the most important and novel provision was that making it possible for Greece and Turkey to exchange their populations. This was put into effect as described above.

The census of 1935 showed that Turkey's population consisted of 94 per cent Turks (i.e., born in Turkey), and, of the total population, 98.6 per cent were Mohammedans. The foreign population was mainly Greek (2.2 per cent) and Bulgarian (1.4 per cent).

The forefathers of the present-day Turks migrated from eastern Asia in the twelfth century, mingled with the Tartars, and, moving on westward, settled in Anatolia. Their number was gradually increased by further migrating Mongols, historically best known as Seljuk Turks, often called "Ghuzz," members of the Turanian family of Mongols. With the weakening of the power of the Seljukian Turks came the Ottoman Turks, another Turanian group that had been thrust out of inner Asia by the Mongol hordes. After considerable strife the Ottomans gained the ascendancy and began to absorb the Seljuks gradually. They established the Ottoman dynasty, and the Turks called themselves "Osmanli," or followers of Osman.⁶

The nature of the group and institutions designated by this term is not easy to grasp for minds accustomed to our Western notions of nations, states and churches. We may come nearest

⁶ "Ottoman" is the Hellenic corruption of "Othman," which is the Arab's rendering of "Osman." Martin Sprengling, "Modern Turkey," in the *Open Court*, XXXVI (May, 1932), p. 281.

to the truth if we designate it as the Osmanli church-state—an institution embodying features of church and state, inextricably intermingled to an extent that the West has never known.

Fundamentally, the Turks belong to the Turanian, Ural-Altaic, or Finno-Tartaric group of the Siberic branch of the Mongolian family. Hence they are related to the Magyars, Finns, Lapps, Japanese and Koreans, but more linguistically than physically, because, racially speaking, the Turk is a mixture of many elements. This has been due to intermarriage of indiscriminate character. The Turkish language remains agglutinative, and is not inflected like that of the neighboring groups. It is the original dialect of the conquerors, filled with borrowed words from Persian and Arabic, as well as from the Greek, Italian, and French.

The Moslem population comprises, besides the Turks of Asia Minor, a considerable number of Kurds in the eastern provinces, Lazes in the eastern section of the Pontic coast, and a few Circassians. There is a fairly considerable but diminishing Jewish element in the towns.⁸ There has of late been a considerable immigration of Turks from Romania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, the majority of whom are being settled in Thrace.

Kurds. The largest national minority are the Kurds. They have settled in the eastern section of Turkey; the vilayet of Hakari is nearly entirely populated by the Kurds, and there are some Kurds settled in Central Anatolia, around Ankara. They are a semi-nomadic people, and their seasonal migration caused numerous conflicts. Furthermore, they live in valleys through which pass ancient and modern trade routes, and formerly levies on trade provided a profitable income for the Kurds. Their organization is tribal; they are fanatical and reactionary Moslems. Their reactionary notions brought on the uprising of 1925. The execution of forty-six of their leaders did not stop the plots against Turkish supremacy, and they blazed into another rebellion in 1930. The Turkish Army was confronted with serious difficulties when suppressing them, because of their geographical distribution. Kurdish minorities exist on Turkish, Persian and

⁸ The Jewish National Assembly of the Republic of Turkey renounced all national minority rights guaranteed to it by Lausanne Treaty of 1926. Cf. The American Jewish Committee, *Twentieth Annual Report 1927* (New York, 1927), pp. 45-56; A. J. Toynbee, *Survey of International Affairs 1925* (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), Vol. I, p. 72.

Iraq territory.⁹ The inroads of the Turkish soldiers on Persian territory when pursuing the Kurds brought on serious difficulties with the Persian Government. Eventually, in January, 1932, both countries signed a protocol by which Little Mount Ararat was given to Turkey, and Persia in exchange received a portion of Turkish territory farther south near the Bajirge Pass. The material sacrifices of Turkey were compensated for by a strategic advantage over turbulent Kurdish tribes. A few of them have, in the meantime, been transplanted to western Anatolia and European Turkey. The language of the Kurds is essentially a Persian dialect, and yet a distinct language in itself, with many words of Turanian origin.

Minorities Policy. Although the Treaty of Lausanne (Articles 37-44) provided for the protection of minorities of Turkey, the Constitution of 1924 made no specific provision for them. Article II of the Constitution provided that "the religion of the Turkish state is Islam," but this was removed in 1928, and the article now reads: "The official language is Turkish." Other articles (68, 69, 70, 75, 80, 87, 88) provide for the civil, political and religious equality of all Turks, and state that "from the standpoint of nationality, all inhabitants of Turkey, without distinction as to religion or race, are eligible to become Turks."

In actual practice, Turkey's minorities are allowed no agitation of any kind such as is carried on in other Balkan States. After its experiences with the capitulations and troubles brought on by the Armenians, the Greeks and the Kurds, the present government is unwilling to allow any minority to become a source of trouble in the present or the future. The extensive propaganda conducted against the Turks for their "massacres" and for their attempts to handle radically the minorities question is remembered resentfully by the Turk, who is now determined not to allow such a situation to occur again. Thus the last vestiges of the capitulatory regime were effaced by the law of May 28, 1928, on Turkish nationality.¹⁰ The law provided among other things that from Jan. 1, 1929 onwards, children born in Turkey of foreigners would be Turkish citizens. Further steps were taken

⁹ After World War I the Kurds seized upon President Wilson's pronouncements about the self-determination of nations and had Sherif Pasha at the Versailles Conference seeking the establishment of an independent Kurdish State; but the Conference was deaf to the appeal.

¹⁰ R. W. Flournoy and M. O. Hudson, *A Collection of Nationality Laws* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 567-572.

in March 1931. The Grand National Assembly passed a law to the effect that all Turkish boys and girls must receive their primary education in Turkish schools.¹¹

Turkey's efforts to liquidate the minorities' problems have not, however, succeeded. At the end of World War II, Russian pressure on Turkey for control of the Dardanelles was linked with a Soviet campaign along the Turkish-Iranian-Iraqi borders to stir up the Armenian, Georgian, Kurdish and Azerbaijan minorities. Soviet Russia's claim to the Turkish districts of Kars and Ardahan is based on the fact that this territory, after having been Ottoman-Turkish for centuries, was ceded to Tsarist Russia by the Ottoman Empire in 1878 after the Russo-Turkish war. The Kremlin ignored the fact that it was returned by Soviet Russia to the Turkish Republic in 1921 after a plebiscite that gave the province to Turkey by a vote of 85,000 to 1,900. Although no Armenians live in the areas of Kars and Ardahan, Soviet Russia is attempting to add these territories to her Armenian Republic.

HISTORY

As the territory of Turkey lies at the junction of three continents, and borders on so many bodies of water, it is no wonder that it has been crossed and recrossed by trade routes, wandering peoples, and contending armies. We first hear of Turkey from Chinese sources.¹² Descendants of a Mongol race in Central Asia, of which the Huns also were an offshoot, the Seljuk Turks, organized as bands of marauding horsemen, began to appear on the borders of Asia Minor toward the middle of the eleventh century. Driven from their Central Asiatic homes by the Mongolian invasions, their fighting qualities earned them the domination of the Anatolian Peninsula. But early in the thirteenth century came

¹¹ A number of German Jews expelled by the Nazis were employed by the Turkish government as professors at the Ankara Agricultural Institute and as doctors at the modern hospital there.

¹² D. G. Hogarth, "Turkey," in Nevill Forbes, A. J. Toynbee, D. Mitrany and D. G. Hogarth, *The Balkans* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1915), p. 322. See also: F. Schevill & W. M. Gewehr, *The History of the Balkan Peninsula* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1933), p. 175 ff. Kimon A. Doukas, "Turkey," Chapter XIII, pp. 225-32, in Joseph S. Roucek, *Central-Eastern Europe*; Chester M. Tobin, *Turkey, Key to the East* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1944); Emil Lengyel, *Turkey* (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1944); Ernest Jackh, *The Rising Crescent; Turkey Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944).

the Ottoman Turks, who were to found the Ottoman Empire. Osman, who began to rule in 1233, slowly conquered all of Asia Minor. By 1300 he had disposed of the Seljuk Kingdom and had assumed the title of Sultan. He recruited the first regiment of professional Ottoman soldiery. In 1361 the Turks captured Adrianople and thus came into contact with other Christian nations—the Greeks and also the Serbians and Hungarians. They were invited by the Greeks to help them against the menace of Tsar Dusan of Serbia, and won the battle of Kossovo in 1389. In spite of a defeat suffered from the Tartars in 1402, the Turks held firmly to their European possessions.

Then came the famous event of 1453, the fall of Constantinople, which is usually considered as the opening of the modern age. Obviously the historians pay more attention to this event than the whole of Europe together did at that time. It marked the passing of the last Greek Empire.

Thereafter Turkish history is little more than a narrative of war, bloodshed and conquest, and the bitterness of the Christians against oppression by the Mussulmans. The famous Janissaries had already introduced new blood among the Turks, and had become the dreaded military force of the Sultan. In the sixteenth century Suleiman I (1520-1566), known as "the Magnificent," conquered Hungary at Mohács (1526). Hungary remained under the Turks for a century and a half thereafter. The advance of the Turks to the gates of Vienna in 1529 roused Europe and brought the Germanic elements into play against the Turkish forces. Furthermore, the new blood was beginning to fail for the governing class, as it could no longer be manned exclusively from the Christian-born. A new dissatisfied class of country gentlemen was rising, which was soon to assume provincial and local jurisdiction and independence.

Then began the decline. The Empire was too large to be administered successfully. The dynasty started to produce degenerate Sultans. The grand vizier and ministers were appointed and removed by invisible harem influences; the sale of offices was followed by oppressive taxation and economic decline. "The heart of the Empire" began to fail. The next two centuries, the seventeenth and eighteenth, are a record of troubles within the Empire. The Janissaries dared to take the lives of two Sultans and the Grand Vizierate was in their hands. The real influence and power was occasionally exercised by Albanian or other

assimilated elements. The second defeat of Vienna in 1683 was the end of military expansions and marked the beginning of the gradual disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Europe assumed the offensive against the Turk. From that time on Turkey was being constantly pushed back into Asia Minor, losing territory and prestige.

Possibly one of the chief sources of difficulties was many foreign nationalities. Caught in the spirit of nationalism through foreign propaganda, they began to plot revolts against Constantinople. On the other hand, the Sultans and their close advisers were indulging in extreme abuse and selfishness and, on the whole, ignored the sad state of internal conditions. Towards the end of the last century, during the reign of Abdul Hamid II, this state of affairs became worse; the empire lost many of its rich provinces, especially in Europe, and state finances fell into a critical condition. The worst effects of the Sultan's misgovernment were felt by his Christian subjects, collectively known as the *rayahs* ("herd," "flock," "cattle"). The victorious Turkish armies of the fifteenth century had spared the lives of the *rayahs*. A few became Mohammedans, and thereby gained admission to the ruling class. But the vast majority remained Christians, a submerged people, separated from the Turks by religion, by language, by costume, by manners and by hatred. They were represented at Constantinople by their Christian bishops, and, above all, by the Greek Orthodox Patriarch. The Russian Tsars regarded themselves as natural protectors of all the Greek Orthodox Christians. As an indirect effect of the French Revolution these *rayahs* transferred the emphasis from religion to nationality. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the patriots of each nationality clamored for emancipation from the Turks and for the aggrandizement of the national groups. Such nationalist agitation led gradually to the dismemberment of Turkey.

In the second half of the eighteenth century the Anatolian feudal families had their heyday. A similar situation existed in Europe. The Balkan provinces, Macedonia and Albania especially, followed readily the orders of their local beys. The insubordination of the Janissaries was openly scandalous, especially in 1807-1809. The reforms of Mahmud II (1808-1839) came too late, although the Janissaries paid with their lives for their impudence. In 1812 the Russian Empire extended its boundaries

to the River Pruth. Great Britain was wringing concessions for herself from the Sultan. The Balkan nations were in a ferment, inspired by national consciousness which eventually nationalized them—and Turkey itself. The Greeks and the Serbs revolted. Another war with Russia took place in 1828 and resulted in the virtual independence of Greece and the extension of practical autonomy to Serbia, and likewise to the Romanian principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. Turkey had to surrender claims on Georgia and other provinces of the Caucasus to Russia, and recognize the exclusive jurisdiction of Russian consuls over Russian agitators representing the Tsar as the protector of the Orthodox Church and the “big brother” of the Slavic nations.

The Crimean War (1854-1856) was but a temporary check to Russia's advance. In 1862 the Union of Moldavia and Wallachia was completed. For a while Great Britain played the role of a protector in the Balkans. Russia, however, again encouraged rebellion in Crete and in 1870 helped the Bulgars to obtain ecclesiastical independence. A real chance for further attacks on Turkey came in 1875-1876 when the Turks cruelly suppressed uprisings in Bosnia, Herzegovina and Bulgaria. The Empire was torn by internal difficulties. But Russia was not to be bluffed by the promulgation of a liberal Constitution in 1876, and in 1877 proclaimed another war, in which Montenegro and Serbia had already participated. The Treaty of San Stefano, its revised edition, and the Treaty of Berlin humiliated Turkey. Russia won the Armenian districts at the eastern extremity of the Black Sea; Austria-Hungary was permitted to occupy Bosnia-Herzegovina; Great Britain occupied Cyprus; the autonomy of Bulgaria was proclaimed; Romania, Serbia, and Montenegro were recognized as completely independent states; and Greece realized an extension of territory.

It did not take long to make further changes—at the expense of Turkey. Eastern Rumelia was incorporated into the Principality of Bulgaria in 1885. The Kingdom of Bulgaria was declared in 1908; and the Province of Bosnia-Herzegovina was annexed by Austria-Hungary in the same year. Meanwhile Turkey had been losing her African possessions. Crete was granted autonomy in 1897, and given to Greece in 1913. France occupied Tunis in 1811, and Tripoli was formed into the Italian colony of Libya in 1912.

The interference of the European Powers in the administra-

tion of Macedonia, and an enormous public debt, were other manifestations of the troubles that the Turks had to face. The promising revolt of the Young Turks in 1908 eventually transformed itself into further difficulties. Bosnia-Herzegovina was lost permanently. Disorders continued in Albania, among the Kurdish troops, among the Armenians and among the various Macedonian races.

The deposition of Abdul Hamid II in 1908 inaugurated the new nationalistic policy of the Young Turks which ended in the two Balkan Wars. By the Treaty of London of May, 1913, Turkey was shorn of nearly all her European possessions, though the Treaty of Constantinople with Bulgaria, of September 29, 1913, returned Adrianople to the Government of the Sultan.

World War I. On the eve of the First World War Constantinople was seething with the intrigues of Russia, Great Britain, Germany and Austria-Hungary, France and Italy. Behind this screen of diplomatic struggle were also the national aspirations of the Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs, Albanians, and Romanians in the Balkan Peninsula and of the Greeks, Armenians, Kurds, Assyrians, Arabs, Maronites, Jews and Druses in Asiatic Turkey. After the defeat of the Central Powers in World War I, a separate armistice was signed at Mudros in 1918 between Turkey on the one hand and the Allies on the other. The Allied forces occupied parts of Turkish territory and intended to allow the Greeks to send their army to Ismir (Smyrna). Mustapha Kemal (who later adopted the name, Kemal Ataturk), then decided to save the country.

In 1921, the Greek armies launched a general offensive up the Sakarya river toward Ankara. But they were utterly defeated, and in August, 1922, in ten days, Kemal's offensive threw the Greek forces into the sea and Anatolia was cleared from foreign occupation. On July 24, 1923, the Lausanne Peace Treaty was signed. It was more than a victory for General Ismet Inonu, the head of the Turkish delegation at Lausanne. It defined the European frontiers of Turkey and to some extent of her Asiatic possessions. On July 20, 1936, a new Straits Convention was signed at Montreux, to take the place of the 1923 Convention, in which Turkey obtained the right to militarize the zone of the Straits. By an agreement between the Turkish and French governments, concluded at Angora on June 23, 1939, the Sanjak of Alexandretta (The Hatay) was incorporated in the Turkish Republic.

CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Turkey has had a rich constitutional development with which, however, we can not be concerned here.¹³ Since Oct. 29, 1923, Turkey has been a republic. The President is elected every four years by the Grand National Assembly, the candidates being chosen from within the members of the Parliament. The Assembly has both the executive and legislative power. The Assembly executes the legislative power and turns over the executive power to the President of the Republic and to the Cabinet appointed by him. The elections for the Assembly are indirect and by secret vote, with one deputy representing every 40,000 people. In 1946 there were thus 465 deputies who represented a population estimated at eighteen million. Every Turkish citizen, male and female, of at least 22 years of age has the right to vote; candidates for office must be 30 years or over.

Local government is highly organized and of ancient standing. The country is divided into 57 *vilayets* (provinces), and these again into *kazas* (counties) and *nahiyes* (districts). A *Vali* is the chief administrative officer of a *vilayet*, being proposed by the Cabinet and appointed by the President of the Republic. The head of a *kaza* is a *kaymakam* proposed by the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior and appointed by the President. The head of a *nahiye* is a *mudir* appointed by the *Vali*. The *Vali* has a General Council to assist him. It meets once a year for a minimum of 15 days and a maximum of 40, with the *Vali* as its presi-

¹³ See: F. R. Dareste and P. Dareste, *Les Constitutions Modernes* (Paris, 3rd ed., 1910), Vol. II, pp. 319-321; E. G. Mears, *Modern Turkey* (New York: Macmillan, 1924), *passim*; Feridouss Fikry, *Le Mouvement constitutionnel en Turquie et la loi sur l'organisation fondamentale d'Angora* (Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1929); André Mary-Rousselière *La Turquie constitutionnelle* (Paris: Reunies, 1925); Ahmed Emin, *Turkey in the World War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), pp. 3-62; Gad Franco, *Developments constitutionnels en Turquie* (Paris: Rousseau, 1926); E. M. Early, "The New Constitution of Turkey," *Political Science Quarterly*, (1925), Vol. XL, pp. 73-100; Albert H. Lybyer, "Government, Turkey," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, VII, pp. 84-86; Herbert F. Wright, *The Constitutions of the States at War 1914-1918* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 590-605; Dagobert Mikuseh, *Mustapha Kemal* (Garden City: Doubleday, Doran, 1931), *passim*; G. Bie Ravndal, *Turkey, A Commercial and Industrial Handbook* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1926), pp. 35-42; *The Near East Year Book 1931-1932* (London: The Near East, 1932), pp. 670-73; *The Open Court*, XLVI (May, 1932), pp. 312-319; D. E. Webster, *The Turkey of Ataturk* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1939), p. 97 ff.

dent. Delegates to this council are elected by *kazas*, in the proportion of one delegate to 15,000 male and female citizens. Nothing now remains of the old Ottoman laws based on religious principles. The present judicial system consists of: (1) *juges de paix* (single judges with limited but summary penal and civil jurisdiction); and (2) *tribunaux de base* (a president and four assistant judges who hear serious penal cases) Appeal has been abolished. The Court of Cassation sits at Ankara.

Civil Code. The Turkish Civil Code is, with the exception of a few modifications, a reproduction of the Swiss Civil Code, as is also the Code of Obligations (since 1926). The new Penal Code is based in great measure upon the Italian Penal Code, and the Code of Civil Procedure, without being identical, nevertheless closely resembles that of the Canton of Neuchâtel. The new Commercial Code is based on the German.

THE TURK AND HIS POLITICS

Turkey has gone through three stages of political experience since the end of the nineteenth century. On the surface they show an evolution from a despotic, imperial government to a constitutional monarchy (1908-1919), and finally to a "democratic" republic (1923 on). Fundamentally, however, there has been very little actual change in the exercise of political power. It has always been of a dictatorial nature. The autocratic power of the Sultan was supplemented after 1908 by the autocratic rule of the Committee of Union and Progress; and after World War I, by the dictatorships of Ataturk and Ismet Inonu.

The masses of the Turkish people have had to remain rather passive, although they seem fully to favor the present regime. But the thin upper layer of statesmen, politicians, and soldiers, who had limited the power of the Sultan and finally wrested it from his hands entirely, is now somewhat changed in its composition. Those who dared to oppose the rule of Ataturk were eliminated; only the supporters of his rule were tolerated. Thus, the political scene of Turkey during the present century has actually been a parade of personalities who have struggled bitterly, at times violently, for power.¹⁴

¹⁴ Joseph S. Roucek, "The Turk and His Politics," *World Affairs Interpreter*, X (July, 1939), pp. 177-184.

JUST ANOTHER DICTATORSHIP?

Following the victory of the Republic, Atatürk emerged victorious from the contest for political power. He had played his game up to the time of his death (1938) cleverly, successfully, and at times quite ruthlessly. It is difficult to compare the present Turkish regime in its political form with any of the contemporary dictatorships. For it has neither the aggressive nationalism and the romantic ideology of Fascism nor the dynamics of Nazi racism or the radicalism of Russia. Furthermore, contrary to the authoritarian system of Nazi Germany, the Turkish authoritarian system was born out of military victory. Hence it started with military laurels, which are so essential for any authoritarian regime to survive, and therefore had no need to look nervously around for this requisite of national unification. In spite of the one-party system, all the forms of constitutional government are preserved. The Turkish Parliament sits and debates with all the formality of a Western Parliament—but little criticism is allowed.

THE FOUNDER OF TURKEY, KEMAL ATATÜRK

The whole authoritarian regime of Turkey was personified by the "Fuehrer" of Turkey, Kemal Atatürk—and today is personified by his successor, General Ismet Inönü, who joined the Kemalists in 1919, was chief organizer of the Nationalist Army, defeated the Greeks at Inönü, Anatolia, and had a great share in the decisive Turkish victory on the Sakarya, and captured Smyrna. As right-hand man and intimate friend of Kemal, he was Minister of Foreign Affairs (1922-1923), signed the Lausanne Treaty, was Prime Minister (1923-1937), and at Kemal's death (1938) was unanimously elected his successor as President of the Republic (November 11, 1938) and as lifelong leader of the Republican People's Party, the dominant political organization of Turkey (December 27, 1938). His objects are the continuation of Kemalism.

What did Kemal want? Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), first President of the Turkish Republic, born in Salonica, the son of a customs official, was a rebel from early life. A headstrong youth, an unruly officer, a great plotter, and finally the revolutionary founder of modern Turkey—wilful independence and

jealous militancy were the marks of his career.¹⁵ He ran away from school to become a soldier. Plotting against the hated Sultan, Abdul Hamid, he founded the "Secret Society of Liberty" in Constantinople, was arrested and banished to far-off assignments. Finally, he joined the Young Turks movement but could not get along with its leader, Enver Pasha. During World War I he defended the Dardanelles (1915). He became a general and held commands in the Caucasus, Hedjaz and Palestine. He had differences with the Germans as he soon foresaw the defeat of Germany in the war and opposed German interference with Turkish internal affairs. But even the drastic armistice of Mudros (1918) did not end his military career. On the contrary, defeated and prostrate Turkey found in Kemal Pasha her first center of resistance. The Constantinople Government made its final mistake by sending him to Anatolia in May 1919 to demobilize the troops stationed there. Instead, he launched a national movement and organized an army in defiance of the Constantinople Government, called a national congress, and declared war against the Greeks who had landed in Asia Minor. With only 2,000 war-worn soldiers he entered upon an apparently hopeless conflict with the Great Powers—and won. Appointed Generalissimo in 1921, he fought and won the 22-day battle on the Sakarya which decided Turkey's fortune. The Revolutionary National Assembly honored him with the title "Ghazi," the Victorious. His smashing of the Greeks resulted in the Treaty of Lausanne which scrapped the peace dictate of Sèvres. As the "liberator" he abolished the Sultanate and Caliphate, declared Turkey a Republic on Oct. 29, 1923, and was unanimously elected President (reelected 1931 and 1935).

Kemal's great reforms were often carried through quite ruthlessly. He crushed the opposition of the Moslem clergy to his mono-religious policy, suppressed communism and an anti-dictatorial conspiracy in 1926, and made ample use of capital punishment. He separated state and religion; banned polygamy, the women's veil and fez; ordered all Turks to wear hats and European clothes; introduced European customs and modern sports;

¹⁵ H. C. Armstrong, *Gray Wolf—Mustafa Kemal* (New York: Minton, Balch, 1933); H. E. Allen, *The Turkish Transformation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935); W. Gilman, "Turkey Offers Her Own Ism," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXII (1938), pp. 212–222; D. von Mikush, *Mustapha Kemal* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1931); D. E. Webster, *The Turkey of Atatürk* (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1939).

ordered a change-over from Arabic to Latin script; and made all Turks adopt surnames, he himself taking that of Ataturk (meaning "Father of the Turks," and dropping the Arabic *Mustapha*). (The non-republican title of Pasha he had dropped earlier.) He died of cirrhosis of the liver in 1938. He left no children.

Every regime becomes symbolized in personality and so the Turks symbolized all their accomplishments in Kemal's great figure. But it must be remembered that the fame of his regime was also due to his devoted collaborators—not least to Ismet Inonu, second in military command and first in political succession. In fact, Kemal was accustomed to entrust the execution of his ideals to the able body of men that he had selected for his government. Only when the process appeared to have lost momentum did the Ghazi himself take a hand in the direct administration. He worked quietly behind the scenes, saying little and showing himself very seldom. When he became aroused, however, he cunningly wove webs of intrigues, which always resulted in the downfall of his opponents. He could become very loquacious, and once made a speech to Parliament which took him six solid days to deliver. He did not hesitate to discard his supporters when their usefulness was at an end. A soldier by training, he had gone through hell and fire, and his terrible military experiences were the reason why he often needed a strong stimulus for stiffening. Hence Kemal had often loved his women where he found them, and his chief recreation was playing poker and drinking the strongest liquor known on earth, *arak*.

FORM OF THE DICTATORSHIP

Turkey's form of government is really a dictatorship of the middle class, not against, but with wishes of the politically inexperienced masses. It operates through the People's Party, a one-party system under the aggressive leadership first of Kemal and then of Inonu. Kemal, as President of the Republic and leader of the party, enforced dictatorial rule by means not only of his control over the army but also by his personal popularity among his people and by his control of the Parliament through his party. Parliament is composed of army officers, state employees, representatives of academic classes, lawyers, doctors and en-

gineers, in addition to journalists and writers, landowners and merchants, and a handful of peasants. It is allowed deliberation and consultation, but no serious criticism or opposition.

To the Kemalist the letter of the Constitution is not violated by this, since Kemal also controlled the only legal party and selected for the parliamentary elections the nominees of the party. Thus in 1927 the Assembly elected a committee to nominate the candidates for the Third Assembly. This committee transferred its powers to Kemal, and the result was that the nation merrily confirmed the President's choice of 315 deputies from among 1,100 candidates whose names had been proposed to him with remarks on their qualifications. A somewhat similar procedure was followed in subsequent elections. In 1931 the People's Party captured 413 seats and the remaining 42 seats were allotted to "Independents."

This experimentation with opposition parties, none of which ever showed enough strength to enter a national election against the dominant Republican Party, was followed by Ismet Inonu in the municipal elections of 1946. By permitting opposition parties to compete with the Republican People's Party he made a very important move to keep Turkey united in the face of outside pressure. The first real opposition movement appeared in 1946 when the Democratic Party was organized by former Premier Djellal Bayar.

ISMET INONU'S RULE

Inonu was elected President of Turkey in 1938, the day after Ataturk's death. Under him, the Turkish revolution has slowed down, consolidating Ataturk's rapid innovations. He can point to his treaties with Britain, France and Russia, by which he was able to keep Turkey out of World War II until a few months before its end.

At home, he permitted Turkey's first general election in which an opposition party seriously challenged the Government. Opposition complaints were all on domestic matters. Bayar, leader of the Democratic Party, charged the Inonu Government with restricting private enterprise, bureaucracy and graft, and using political patronage to entrench itself in power. He accused the regime of throttling civil liberties, including freedom of the

press. These are complaints made by a party largely controlled by businessmen in Turkey's populous Western provinces. Many of them resent the dominant position of state monopolies and state industries in Turkey's economic life. Landowners who are slated to lose parts of their estates to peasants under the new land laws also tended to side with the opposition groups. Bayar himself is a former banker.

The opposition parties in the 1946 elections won nearly 100 seats out of a total of 465 in the National Assembly. The Democrats won more than 50. Marshal Fezvi Cakmak, former Chief of Staff, promoted his independent candidacy with full support by Bayar's Democratic Party. Inonu helped, however, to insure victory for his party by staging the elections six months earlier than originally planned.

THE IDEOLOGY OF KEMALISM AND INONUISM

A Kemalist, according to the best definition of the Kemal ideologists, is a man who stands for nationalism, republicanism, secularism, modernization of industry and agriculture and controlled national economy. Under such indefinite terms come such important changes as the emancipation of women; the abolition of polygamy; the separation of religion from the state; the restrictions placed on foreign schools; the suppression of religious, Ottoman and minority allegiances; the ban on the fez; the substitution of a Turkish alphabet, derived from the Latin instead of the Arabic hieroglyphics, and the replacement of Turkish for Ottoman, Arabic and foreign words; the encouragement of public and adult education; the upbuilding of economic self-sufficiency and the inauguration of a "Five-Year Industrial Plan" in 1933; the remodelling of the laws of Turkey, based upon the Civil Code of Switzerland, the Criminal Code of Italy, and the Commercial Code of Germany, adjusted to the needs of Turkey; the conscription of the entire adult male population for the national service of building a system of roads; government monopoly of such public utilities as the post-office, telephone, telegraph and the radio.

Basically speaking, Kemalism wanted to make the Turk aware that he is equal to the other peoples of the world and that his state means something to him. It wants to enlarge his horizon,

which formerly was limited to the weekly market visits—the most important event in the lives of the peasant and artisan. In fact, it wants, as Hans Kohn says, “to supplant the traditional tempo of life in the agrarian and backward parts of Turkey by the rhythm of the industrial north.”¹⁶ Turkey had no other choice than to adopt Western civilization in order to withstand Western imperialism. This process is, of course, full of problems and difficulties, as became especially obvious with the new demands made on Turkey at the end of World War II.

SOVIET RUSSIA AND TURKEY

Due to the fact that during both World Wars, the Dardanelles was inaccessible to Russia, the Soviet Union today considers a place in the Eastern Mediterranean and control of the Dardanelles as vital to her defenses and future plans. To this end, in 1946-47 Russia added to the turmoil in Greece by encouraging her Balkan satellites and the Greek Communists to oppose the British-supported monarchy. Russia also sent two notes to Turkey demanding that the Turks negotiate with the Soviet Union, *alone*, over the Dardanelles. Control of the Straits through a partnership with Turkey was Russia's minimum objective.

Britain opposed the move, fearing that such a partnership would make Turkey subservient to Russia's will and enable Russia to reach the oil of the Middle East, outflank Greece and threaten Suez, thus relegating Britain to a secondary role in world affairs. For that reason, Britain kept her troops in Iraq, at Turkey's back door, and in Greece, where King George II commanded a British-trained army of Greeks. A pro-British Greece and an independent Turkey as the guardian of the Straits is Britain's minimum demand. The United States, like Britain, has a stake in the oil lands of the Middle East. Washington recognizes that Greece and Turkey are two-way gates for strategy. Control of either of these nations by either Russia or Britain would give each a base for offensive operations against each other.

¹⁶ Hans Kohn, “Ten Years of the Turkish Republic,” *Foreign Affairs*, XII (October, 1933), pp. 141-155. A useful survey is F. T. Merrill, “Twelve Years of the Turkish Republic,” *Foreign Affairs*, XI (October, 1935), pp. 190-200; S. H. Jameson, “Social Mutation in Turkey,” *Social Forces*, XIV (May, 1936), pp. 482-496.

Thus the United States would prefer to see a strong Greece, capable of defending herself. Washington would also agree to some degree of Russian participation in the control of the Dardanelles, but views potential Russian domination of Turkey and Greece as a threat to her own world interests as well as to those of her ally, Britain. By dispatching warships to this area in 1946 Washington backed the United States' minimum objective—a settlement that would not weaken Turkey so much that she would be drawn behind the "Iron Curtain."

Turkey is strong, but not strong enough to defend the Straits without assistance. She must rely on diplomatic help from the United States and Britain to meet Russia's demands. The Turks, intensely patriotic, stand united behind their government against the Russian demands. There is no Communist Party in Turkey; it still is banned. Thanks to a strange alliance between Ataturk's young republic and the new regime in Russia, an alliance that lasted for most of the period between the two world wars, there are as yet no signs of a Communist underground in Turkey. Russia's attempts to exclude the United States and Britain from the negotiations over the Straits have set off a chain reaction of power politics and displays of military strength which are bound to continue for many years to come.

RECENT TRENDS

When the Kamutay met for the first time on August 5, 1947, Ismet Inonu was re-elected President; but votes were also cast by the Democratic (opposition) Party of Djelal Bayar for Marshal Fevzi Cakmak, former Commander-in-Chief of the Turkish Army. This was the first time when election to the Republic's Presidency was not unanimous. Prime Minister Sucru Saracoglu, leader of the Republican People's Party, gave up his office on August 4, 1947; Recep Peker, a former member of the Cabinet, formed a new Cabinet, and resigned on September 9, 1947, in favor of Foreign Minister Hasan Saka.

On the whole, the People's Party has exercised great restraint in dealing with its opponents; only a few have been executed or exiled.¹⁷ One-party system has not been glorified as an ideal

¹⁷ W. L. Wright, Jr., "Truths About Turkey," *Foreign Affairs*, XXVI (January,

system of government and its possible replacement by a two-party or multi-party regime has always been envisioned. The caucuses of the People's Party have been characterized by numerous debates; the same applies to the committees of the National Assembly. President Inonu, who has resigned the leadership of the People's Party, has been trying to lift the prestige of the presidential office above the level of party politics. (No doubt that the factor to be considered in this connection was the dependence of Turkey on the great democracies of the West.) At the same time, Turkey has not been burdened, as the neighboring Balkan states, with an excess number of high school and university graduates; so far, the bureaucratic system has been able to absorb all the graduates from the university and technical schools. At the same time, the bureaucratic system has been growing, and there is no aspect of human existence which has escaped the supervision of this octopus in Turkey. "The real danger to orderly democratic development within Turkey comes not from Communism or Fascism but from indefinite expansion in function and personnel of a bureaucracy which is often (though not always) honest and public-spirited but has inherited and perfected all the devices for control of the people that both orient and occident have invented."¹⁸ At the same time, the omnipresent police supervise clubs and societies and, especially, all possible cells of communistic activities. The press, while theoretically free, is in practice subject to very strong pressure from the government.

But Turkey faced more than the usual share of internal problems of the state in terms of its economic and international troubles. Since VE-day, Turkey has been burdened with the cost of maintaining its armed forces on a wartime basis because of the uncertain international situation. This heavy financial burden is largely responsible for the comparatively slow progress in the country's reconversion to full peacetime operations. Unlike Greece, however, Turkey was not in imminent financial danger; her budget deficit was covered by internal loans; a recent devaluation of the currency kept exports at a high level. The United States was Turkey's best customer, and Britain second best. Turkey had a gold reserve and after World War II received

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 358.

United States loans totalling \$40,000,000 for the purchasing of industrial equipment, surplus property and merchant ships.

Foreign Relations. Turkey was strengthened in 1947 as an advance base against U.S.S.R.'s expansion into the Middle East by the United States Congress approval of President Truman's request to let the Turks have \$150,000,000. The money was wanted mainly for military purposes and for strategic improvements that have military value. The basic strategy behind the United States program was that Turkey, as the most solidly anti-Communist country on Russia's border, merited United States support along with Greece.

Since World War II ended, Turkey has been under constant pressure to grant Russia special rights in the Dardanelles.¹⁹ Russia's pressure has taken the form of official demands, press and radio attacks on the Turkish government and suggestions that Turkey should give the U.S.S.R. the eastern provinces of Kars and Ardahan. By linking Turkey with Greece in the first expression of the Truman Doctrine, and by the granting of \$100,000,000 worth of special military assistance, the United States indicated the strategic importance of the Dardanelles to America. American aid to Turkey, unlike that to the government in Athens, was entirely military. Furthermore, there were in Turkey no deep political divisions comparable to those in Greece; fundamentally, the issue between the Democratic Party and the government was that of the "outs" versus the "ins." Consequently, the arrangements which the United States made with Turkey took a much more general form than in the case of Greece; instead of requiring the government in Ankara to observe certain stated conditions, it was merely provided that the chief of the American mission charged with implementing the aid program should consult with Turkish representatives and determine the conditions under which assistance should be granted. Moreover, no reference was made to any possibility that aid might be suspended; and the provision for full information concerning the progress of the program was subjected to the

¹⁹ See: Harry N. Howard, "The United States and the Problem of the Turkish Straits," *The Middle East Journal*, I (January, 1947), pp. 59-72; George Moorad, "Can Russia Take Turkey?" *American Mercury*, LXV (October, 1947), pp. 410-415; Cevat Acikalin, "Turkey's International Relations," *International Affairs*, XXIII (October, 1947), pp. 477-491; Winifred N. Hadsel, "The Turkish Straits and the Great Powers," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XXII (October 1, 1947), pp. 174-184.

important reservation that all publicity should be "consistent with the security of the two countries."²⁰

At the same time, Turkey was strengthening its position in regard to her eastern neighbors.²¹ Friendly relations between Turkey and her small neighbors to the west, east, and south were developed slowly after the end of World War I. The multi-lateral security agreement with Turkey's western neighbors (culminating in the Balkan Pacts of 1934) was complemented in 1937 by the so-called Saadabad Pact between Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Afghanistan which provided for non-aggression pledges among the participants and consultation in the case of outside aggression against any of them. But the crisis of World War II broke this regional security system—and neither the Balkan Entente nor the Saadabad Pact found practical application.

After World War II, Turkey could not hope to rebuild the system of mutual regional guarantees; her Balkan neighbors, with the exception of Greece, were in the Russian orbit. Hence Turkey's neighboring countries with whom she could establish closer relations were the Arab states, and only on the basis of bilateral agreements.

Here an outstanding problem has been that of the so-called Sanjaq (district) of Alexandretta (called Hatay by Turkey), an area on the Asiatic mainland, northeast of Cyprus, with a population of approximately 246,000, a mixed population of Arabs, Turks, and Kurds. By the 1921 (Franklin-Boullion) agreement, the region was left within the French mandate of Syria and Lebanon; in 1936, Syria and France agreed to the termination of the French mandate and to the creation of a unified, independent Syrian state, although this treaty never came into effect. Turkey thereupon objected to the League of Nations that the treaty of 1921 was violated. The agreement of January 27, 1937, granted special rights to Turkey, but Turkey remained dissatisfied with an autonomous Sanjaq within the Syrian state. Eventually, the

²⁰ On July 12, 1947, Turkey and the United States signed a formal agreement implementing the American military aid program. In January, 1948, the United States Government delivered to Turkey four large modern submarines as the major step in a series of new moves including the transfer of eleven other naval vessels to Turkey. In the same month, Turkey agreed to ratify an agreement signed with the United States for the inauguration of a highway program in order to "advance the stability of the national economy and the freedom and security of Turkey."

²¹ "Turkey's Relations with Its Arab Neighbors: A New Area of American Concern," *American Perspective*, I (June, 1947), pp. 135-146.

Franco-Turkish agreement of June 23, 1939, provided for the cession of Sanjaq to Turkey. But the Syrians, emerging from World War II with an independent Republic of Syria, refused to have this question settled. The issue might prove a bothersome source of conflict in the Near East in the near future.

On the other hand, Turkey signed treaties of friendship with Iraq (April 29, 1946) and with Transjordan (January 11, 1947). At the same time, Turkey refused in any shape or form to be drawn into the argument over the division of Palestine.

American aid to Turkey under the Truman Doctrine, involving as it does political as well as economic considerations, will bring the United States into closer touch with the problems of the Near East as a whole than has been the case heretofore.

Whatever the "democratic" character might be of the form of the Turkish state, the United States was backing Turkey at the turn of 1948 as the contact point in East-West rivalry over the Mediterranean. The number of American military advisers was being increased; the Turkish navy was to be strengthened by addition of fifteen American naval vessels. The basic aim was to work out a strategy that would blunt the U.S.S.R.'s spearhead aimed at the Mediterranean.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLEN, HENRY E., *The Turkish Transformation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935).

ARMSTRONG, H. C., *Gray Wolf—Mustafa Kemal, An Intimate Study of a Dictator* (New York: Minton, Balch, 1933). A frank, and in many ways a good biography of Mustapha Kemal. It should be read, however, in comparison with other studies of the late Turkish leader.

HOWARD, HARRY N., *The Partition of Turkey—A Diplomatic History, 1913–1923* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1931). A study of the downfall of the Ottoman Empire and the foundations of the Turkish Republic.

JACKH, ERNEST, *The Rising Crescent; Turkey Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1944). The new political life of Turkey and the men who helped bring about her reformation are portrayed here by the author, who lived in Turkey from 1908 to 1918.

PARKER, JOHN, and SMITH, CHARLES, *Modern Turkey* (London: Rout-

- ledge, 1940). A well-balanced, popular account of the development of modern Turkey based on some firsthand information.
- SHOTWELL, JAMES T., and DEAK, FRANCIS, *Turkey at the Straits* (New York: Macmillan, 1940). An excellent brief summary of the problem.
- TOBIN, CHESTER M., *Turkey, Key to the East* (New York: Putnam, 1944). A study of the growth of modern nationalism.
- WARD, BARBARA, *Turkey* (New York: Oxford, 1942). Shows Turkey's reactions to the diplomatic and military developments of World War II.
- WEBSTER, DONALD E., *The Turkey of Ataturk* (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1939). One of the best volumes for the study of comparative government in regard to Turkey.

LATIN AMERICA

The world known to us in the social aggregate as Latin America is of supreme political importance to the United States, as was shown during World War II. Although the concept is misleading, since Argentina and Panama, separated geographically widely from each other, are included under the one category of "Latin America," the term is used here for the sake of introducing the student to a continent which, after all, has developed definite political characteristics of its own. In general, the governments and politics of that region resemble most closely those developed by the Balkans. As in the case of the Balkans, we find here the marked discrepancy between the symbolic value of constitutionalism and the widespread disregard of democratic formulas in practice. In general, the Latin American governments are nearer to dictatorial than to representative methods. The absence of a broad structure of public opinion, providing political education for the masses, and the efforts to run the governments on efficient lines have contributed to the creation of "strong men" who impose their dictatorships by violent methods, when necessary.

While in Russia, Germany, and Italy, "strong-men" regimes were supported by political ideologies which gave full approval to actual political practices, in the Latin American states the dictators issue periodical pronouncements eulogizing parliamentary and democratic institutions, or at least promise to return to them. But the accent is placed on personalities, not so much on ideologies, whose programs are really subsidiary. Uniforms are everywhere much in evidence, and the army here is an integral part of society and by no means its servant. A military junta frequently takes a place in the political schemes, and bullets often play an important part in the political changes. Certainly, here military dictatorship is much more in harmony with the national traditions of government than constitutionalism. The attempts to imitate the example provided by the United

States Constitution have proved to be devoid of results in most of these countries and the resulting brand of politics has been quite puzzling to the average American observer, who is unable to understand the discrepancy between the semantic allegiance paid to the symbols of democracy and parliamentarism and the harsh realities of political processes.

GEOPOLITICAL BACKGROUND

The term "Latin America" is now used to designate all the countries of the New World whose language and culture is either Spanish, Portuguese, or French. The term includes Mexico, the six Central American republics, the three Caribbean states of Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, and the ten independent states of South America. Whether or not the term includes the British, French, and American possessions in the West Indies, British Honduras, or French, Dutch, and British Guiana, must be determined by the context.

The expression "Latin America" is of relatively recent origin and seems to have been invented to avoid the illogical practice of including in "Spanish America" the half of South America (Brazil), whose culture is Portuguese, and the French-speaking people of the Republic of Haiti. The new term is sometimes criticized because it fails to suggest that many of the states included have populations which are predominantly Indian, both in blood and speech. However, popular usage will have its way, and despite some protest from the more ardent friends of Spanish culture, it seems that the term "Latin America" is destined to supplant all its rivals.¹

The Land And The People. Latin America includes all the New World lying south of the Rio Grande, an area more than three times as large as the United States. In it is considerably more than half of the land surface of the Western Hemisphere. In it are to be found the New World's highest mountains, its biggest river, vast plains, and almost every kind of climate, soil and other natural resource. Because we have given a single name to this vast region we are inclined to attribute to it a homogeneity which is completely lacking in fact. However, because of the

¹ For the contention that "Latin America" is a French creation which neglects the essentially Indian character of most of the nations to which it is applied, see Luis Quintanilla, *A Latin American Speaks* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), pp. 6-10.

impossibility of discussing in detail each of the twenty nations concerned, attention will be called to those characteristics which all of them, or groups of them, may have in common.

Indians. Prior to the arrival of the Europeans, all of what is now called Latin America was inhabited by people of Asiatic origin. Although they were most numerous on the plateaus of Mexico and Peru, they were found in all the regions occupied by the Spanish and Portuguese conquerors. Where the natives were few, as in Argentina and Uruguay, they were eliminated or absorbed until, in those states, there can no longer be said to be an Indian problem. In some of the Caribbean islands, the relatively larger Indian populations were practically eliminated by wars, forced labor in the mines, and the introduction of European diseases. In the other regions of Latin America, the Indians were and are an important element.

Statistics purporting to disclose the racial composition of peoples are notoriously inaccurate and this is particularly true of the Latin American nations. Our chief reliance must be placed on the estimates of specialists in this field who have supplemented official figures with personal observation. An indication of the racial composition of various Latin American states is given in the following table:

RACIAL COMPOSITION OF LATIN AMERICAN PEOPLES²
(In percentages)

Country	Pure Indian	Indian-White	Negroid	Pure White
Mexico	30	60		10
Guatemala	70-80	No breakdown of population with Indian blood		1-
El Salvador	20-	79		1
Honduras			Appreciable	1
Costa Rica				90
Haiti			95	
Colombia	10		Appreciable	10
Venezuela		70-90		
Ecuador	50		15	1-8
Peru	50	35	5	10
Bolivia	60	30		Few
Chile	5	65-75		20-30
Paraguay		97		
Uruguay		10		90
Argentina	1-	1-		98
Brazil	2	11	36	51

² The above figures are based largely on various chapters of Preston E. James, *Latin America* (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1942), and William Lytle Schurz, *Latin America* (New York: Dutton, 1942).

From the foregoing table it is apparent that except for Argentina, Uruguay, and Costa Rica, the racial diversity of the Latin American peoples is even greater than in the United States. The fact that the whites are a minority in so many of these countries would probably be of little consequence, if the culture of the Indian and Negro elements were at the level of the whites. However, in general this is not true and the cultural backwardness of the non-whites creates serious problems. If the backwardness of the non-whites is due solely to lack of opportunity, the states with large Indian or Negro populations may not, in the long run, be handicapped in their cultural advance. However, if such backwardness is, in part, biologically determined, the future of many Latin American states is not too bright. In any event, the problem of raising the cultural level of their Indian and Negro populations will tax the ingenuity and resources of those states which are confronted with it.³

The European Stock. Another factor that is common to all the Latin American states is that they were conquered and occupied by Spanish, Portuguese and French adventurers who established their culture, language, and religion, not only for their own descendants, but for most of the Indians as well. The languages introduced may have had little effect on the development of the Latin American states, but the political and religious institutions which were transplanted from Europe were of primary importance.

The Spaniards and Portuguese of the sixteenth century introduced into the New World the principle of absolutism. No democratic procedures were employed in either their states or their Church. Nor had they any experience with self-government in local affairs, for these were arranged through the local *caciques* or bosses. Many students believe that the political difficulties of the Latin American states are largely due to the political inexperience of those who organized the new governments after independence was won.⁴

³ For a detailed treatment of the characteristics of the various racial stocks in Latin America and the racial problems of the individual states, see Schurz, *op. cit.*, Part III.

⁴ Political inexperience as an explanation of the failures in the conduct of Latin American states is ably discussed in James Bryce, *South America* (New York: Macmillan, 1913), Ch. XV. The difficulties which confront the development of democracy in Latin American states have never been more clearly described nor more fairly appraised.

Land System. A system of large estates (*latifundia*) was introduced into the New World by the conquerors from Spain and Portugal and this system has contributed to the social and political instability of all the Latin American states. In regions where the land is owned by a minority of absentee landlords who lead unproductive and ostentatious lives in the capitals—with long vacations in Paris—the share-cropping tenants are little attached to the institutions which victimize them. It should cause no surprise that they are frequently willing enough to support any ambitious leader who promises to overthrow the existing regime. It is reported that even in so advanced a country as Argentina 85 per cent of the agricultural land is cultivated by tenant farmers, and that the owners take from one-third to one-half of what the workers produce.⁵

In part because of the sparsity of population, many Latin Americans have been willing to mine the mountains, rob the soil and then move on to what appear at least to be greener pastures. The speculative mining or "boom town" fever pervades those who direct business enterprises. They want to get rich quick and return to Rio, to Buenos Aires or to Paris, and the same spirit in the masses enables the states to drain off their meager savings by selling them lottery tickets. Where there is no economic security, people care little for the permanence of governments, and are willing to give the political wheel another turn.

Living Conditions. Living conditions vary greatly from one country to another and from one class to another within the same country. Most of Latin America however is characterized by poverty and social and economic backwardness. Particularly in those countries with a large Indian, Negro or mestizo population, the general picture is pretty sombre. The distinguished Latin American writer, Luis Quintanilla, reports that Latin America is, in general, in a feudal state of development, characterized by absentee ownership, industrial backwardness, disease, illiteracy, fanaticism, and a sharp cleavage between the wealthy landowners and the millions of "underdogs."⁶

Quintanilla concludes his description of poverty throughout Latin America with the startling statement that out of a popula-

⁵ John W. White, *Argentina* (New York: The Viking Press, 1942), p. 7.

⁶ For a more complete picture of living conditions in Latin America see Luis Quintanilla, *A Latin American Speaks* (New York: Macmillan, 1943), Ch. V.

tion of 126,000,000 no fewer than 85,000,000 are actually starving, "and have no houses, no beds, no shoes." The counting of beds seems to be one of the vagaries of the Mexican census, which reports slightly more than 5,000,000 beds for a population of nearly 20,000,000 people, but it is not clear how many of these are double beds. Of the 3,884,600 houses in Mexico, fewer than 265,000 have running water.

In the matter of illiteracy the record is equally deplorable. In Honduras, Bolivia, Paraguay, Guatemala, Haiti, and Ecuador, the illiteracy rate ranges from 73 to 83 per cent; in Peru, Nicaragua, Brazil, and Venezuela it is around 70 per cent; in the Dominican Republic, Panama and Cuba, 60 per cent; El Salvador, 55 per cent; Colombia, 50 per cent; Mexico, 45; Costa Rica, 32; Chile, 24; Uruguay, 20; Argentina, 12; the United States and Canada, 4.3.

From these facts it is clear that much of Latin America is caught in a vicious circle. The people are poor and diseased because they are ignorant, and they are ignorant and diseased because their poverty makes it impossible to afford educational facilities and adequate medical care. Many Latin American writers have insisted that, at least in the states where the Indian blood is dominant, the condition of the less fortunate masses is no better, and in many ways worse, than at the time of the Spanish conquest. In fact, the disturbing thing about so much of Latin America is not that conditions are bad, but that in many parts of it they have shown little or no improvement since the arrival of the Spaniards and the Portuguese some four hundred years ago.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

The Spanish-speaking peoples of Latin America secured their independence from Spain during the first part of the nineteenth century. The causes leading to their revolt were complex, but among them were a desire for a freer commerce with other nations, a resentment at the political and social privileges—and the incompetence—of the Spanish-born members of the bureaucracy, and a hope that their lot would be improved if they established republican forms of government. Notwithstanding their remoteness from the world and their general illiteracy, they had been

profoundly impressed by the successes of our war for independence and the French Revolution. The ideas of the French revolutionists were particularly important because the French Revolution was more recent than our own, and French ideas have always been dominant in Latin American thought.⁷

With their independence secured, the newly created Spanish-speaking nations underwent a period of disorder and confusion almost without parallel in history. There was the constant struggle between individuals for the new governmental posts, frontiers were ill-defined, and large states were disintegrating into smaller ones. The United Provinces of Central America, after about twelve years, dissolved into five separate states. Great Colombia, after about four years, became Colombia, Venezuela and Ecuador. What is now Uruguay was at first a part of Brazil, then a member of the loose federation of Argentinian provinces, and finally owed its independent existence to the rivalry between Argentina and Brazil.

The period of independence ushered in, and perhaps made necessary, an incredible number of new constitutions, most of them still-born, or destined to die in infancy. The oldest is that of the Argentine Republic (1853) and it has undergone important amendments. Under the recent dictatorship it was, for some time, suspended. In the sixteen years following 1925, fourteen new constitutions were put into effect in Latin America and it is probable that more constitutions have been drafted there than in all the rest of the world since time began. Many of them are replete with eloquent tributes to democracy, justice, rights of man, effective suffrage, the principle of "no reelection" or whatever phrase is timely when the constitution is drafted.⁸

The central feature of Latin American governments is a system of personal rule. At times it is exercised under constitutional forms, and at other times it is a naked dictatorship, but, with few exceptions, and for brief periods, the pattern is universal. The concept of a "strong president," normally independent of,

⁷ For the way in which Latin America has looked to France for intellectual leadership, see Luis Quintanilla, *op. cit.*, p. 9; and John W. White, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

⁸ André Siegfried, a sympathetic French critic of Latin America, doubts if England, the mother of constitutional government—never having written a constitution for herself—can ever understand the Latin American delight in "verbal voluptuousness" (*Amérique Latine*, p. 100) and Samuel Inman reports that young Argentinians, considering membership in the Y.M.C.A., first ask to see the constitution (*Latin America*, p. 25).

or in control of, the national legislature, with power to "intervene" in the administration of the states or provinces, conformed to the political traditions of the Spanish colonies. After independence the president became a new and less stable viceroy, ruling in fact, by virtue of the power he could command rather than because he was the free choice of the people or their elected representatives. The many constitutions that have been written will shed less light on the governments of Latin America than will an examination of the system of personal rule, which is the American precursor of the *Führer Prinzip* adopted by the European fascists.⁹

PRESIDENTS AND DICTATORS

James Bryce and André Siegfried, two distinguished foreign observers, agree that the presidential system, copied from the United States, has worked badly in Latin America. It has resulted in the proliferation of dictators whose tyranny is seldom ended save by the doubtful remedy of revolution. The presidential system, which strengthens the chief executive as against the Congress, merely reenforced the Latin American tendency to look to the leader, the *caudillo*, the boss, the strong man. The adoption of the presidential system seems to have strengthened personal and arbitrary government of a kind that was endemic in Latin America long before it appeared in Italy and Germany.

Where the president is all-powerful, he rules as a dictator even though he be an elected one. Many Latin American dictators have enjoyed a wide popularity. In fact, one seldom becomes a dictator unless, at some time in his career, he is popular with the army, the civilian population, or both. But a dictator, however popular, is none the less a dictator, and, however beneficent his regime, it cannot be called a democratic one. With few exceptions the Latin American nations, although republican in form, have been governed by dictators to such an extent that it is doubtful if many of them should be classed among the democracies.

The life history of a dictator is always a fascinating historical

⁹ Good discussions of personal rule in Latin American states are available in William Lytle Schurz, *Latin America* (New York: Dutton, 1942), Part IV and Duncan Aikman, *The All-American Front* (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1942), Ch. XI.

and psychological study, but there have been so many of them in Latin America that individual treatment is impossible.¹⁰ Historians have found a certain periodicity in these dictatorships, with concentrations in 1835, 1850, 1865, 1890, 1910, and 1935. There are few present indications that the phenomena is disappearing. On the contrary, the more stable countries such as Argentina have recently dropped into the general Latin American pattern.

The dictators may be divided into civilians and soldiers but, whatever their origin, they are uniformly "strong men" who run their states as a private enterprise. They disregard all constitutional limitations, although they may delight in giving themselves such titles as "Restorer of the Laws," "Pacificator" or "Protector of the Constitution." Some have been well educated, others have been illiterate, but all of them display what has been called "heroic audacity and perpetual virile unrest."¹¹

Many of them would be described in American slang as the "show-off" type, displaying an infantile interest in white chargers, bullet-proof automobiles of elaborate design, and elaborate uniforms. Their courtiers have little trouble in persuading them to permit avenues, parks, public squares and buildings to be named after them, and statues are frequently erected in their honor during their life time. Not all of them have been financially dishonest, but many of them, just before their luck ran out, succumbed to the temptation to loot the treasury of an "ungrateful" people, and retire to Paris—the Mecca of Latin Americans seeking either learning or debauchery.

To hold his position, a dictator must have the confidence of the army. At times he may come to power without its intervention, and he may govern without it, but he cannot survive its opposition. In fact, the primary function of the ludicrous little armies maintained by some of the smaller states is to support the dictator on his uneasy seat while he disburses promotions and appropriations to his military supporters. In fact, there is much less idealism about their revolutions and their *coups d'état* than is sometimes supposed. They frequently mean nothing more than that the army, or some other powerful group, is getting less

¹⁰ Good summaries of the lives of twenty-two of the most famous are to be found in A. Curtis Wilgus, *South American Dictators* (Washington, D. C.: George Washington University Press, 1937).

¹¹ F. Garcia Calderon, *Latin America* (London: Fisher, Unwin, 1918), p. 96.

from the public treasury than it hopes to get by changing the head of the state—and it proceeds to make the change.¹²

However, in Latin America, even men of good will may at times resort to violence, for once a dictator is well established, the most unselfish patriots may have no recourse but to turn to illegality and revolution. It has been said that revolutions in Latin America accomplish much the same thing as is accomplished by general elections in the more stable democracies. When, as frequently happens, a change can be made with a minimum of bloodshed, a neat little revolution may serve as an adequate substitute for an electoral contest, and at the same time offer some excitement to the masses whose lives are chronically drab and dull.

It would be wrong however to assume that, because dictators persist in Latin America, there are no fundamental changes taking place. In many of these states an interest in public affairs seems to be gradually spreading down to the humblest classes—even in the predominantly Indian republics. For generations politics was a kind of game carried on by the older families—predominantly white—while the Indians and, to a lesser extent the mestizos, played the inert spectators' role. Political contests were feuds between groups of the "best families" and were as foreign to the masses as polo or bridge.

However, as a result of some increase in literacy, improved means of communication and the proselytizing fervor of socialists and communists, the masses are beginning to stir. In the countries where this process continues, politics may increasingly take the form of a struggle between the social and economic classes. To date, Mexico is the nation which is most committed to the socialist program, and countries with a similar class structure may follow her example. In that event, their politics would cease to be a mere struggle for power between selfish individuals, and would be—for better or worse—a struggle between economic classes.

One solution for the problem of the dictator and the irresponsible executive would be the acceptance of the parliamentary form of government. Various countries have tried to make their ministers more or less responsible to their parliaments by requiring them to submit to questioning, etc., but so long as the

¹² For the absence of idealism in most Latin American revolutions see André Siegfried, *Amérique Latine* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1934), pp. 123-132.

real executive is a popularly elected president, independent of the legislative branch of government, a logical development of parliamentary government is difficult.¹³

Labor, Students, and Communists. It is of importance to note that South America's labor organizations have followed the model provided by Europe rather than by North America. The patterns of German socialism or of Spanish-French syndicalism and anarchism have been followed. The tropical countries, having few immigrants, received the impact of such labor ideologies only after World War I when Europe's agitators started their work in the oil, sugar and fruit fields.

This being the case, the European problems of labor have also been patterned in Latin America, although Europe's conditions giving rise to syndicalism, anarchism and communism had been absent from the local scene. Furthermore, the agitation here has been carried on by the native intellectuals who have used a kind of benevolent dictatorship in passing them on to the proletariat. In combination, these factors have prevented labor from basing its demands on its local needs and often the benefits growing out of social struggles have benefited aliens rather than the groups themselves. A lot of time has been wasted on the arguments over the "meaning" of the various ideologies. Rivalries among outside organizations, as well as the native inclinations towards individualism, explain also the large number of small unions which split up Latin American labor. This lack of unity, in turn, explains why labor has been unable to force its program on governments. Uruguay, for instance, a small agricultural country, has a syndicalist, a communist, an anarchist, a reformist, and several other minor labor movements. Chile's workers have been similarly weakened by struggles within the ranks of syndicalism, I.W.W.'s, Catholic, and communist organizations.

Unions draw their support chiefly from transportation, textiles, public utilities, petroleum, mining, food processing, and, sometimes only, agriculture; there are also unions of civil servants, hotel workers, teachers, and printers. Teachers, clerks, mo-

¹³ For an account of parliamentary and semi-parliamentary governments in Latin America, see William S. Stokes, "Parliamentary Government in Latin America," *The American Political Science Review*, XXXIX (June, 1945), pp. 522-536; Samuel Guy Inman, *Latin America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937), Book Three, "The Republics Today," pp. 131-290, and Book Four, "New Forces," pp. 291-388.

tion picture operators, state and municipal employees, musicians, and even retail merchants have their own *sindicatos*, *uniones*, *cooperatives*, and *sociedades*, sometimes affiliated with the national trade union federations. Unions are most powerful in Mexico, Argentina and Chile.

The activities of students are quite a surprising phenomenon for the American observers, who are amazed at the emotionalism of youth which takes itself here very seriously. Deadly interested in politics, university youth generally represents the leftist protest against the old order. Not averse to using violence, the movement in other respects takes on various aspects in various countries. In all cases, however, university students take prominent parts in revolutions, and are usually used as a battering ram by politicians, who, once in power, forget them.

Communism first turned up as an organized force in Latin America after World War I. It is extremely difficult to separate the local aspects of the movement from Soviet propaganda. Inman concludes that "most movements called communist south of the Rio Grande may be more accurately described as 'radical.'" As has become customary throughout the world, dictatorial governments dispose of their opponents by accusing them of communism. Whether or not the Comintern is in the background, the fact remains that radical movements are attacking the old order in three-fourths of the Latin-American states; they are critical of land monopoly, peonage, and foreign economic or ecclesiastical exploitation. In June, 1932, Chile had a socialist government for a few days under Colonel Marmaduke Grove; in Mexico several states at various times were under a communist regime, and the Communists dictated government policy for over a year when they were strong in Buenos Aires in 1920. A small group of Cuba's Communists were quite influential in the six-month regime of President Grau San Martín in 1933-1934, and Communist Parties participated in elections in Mexico, Cuba, Chile, Uruguay, Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, and Costa Rica. At the same time, it is also obvious that the Comintern did not miss its opportunities here, and branches of the Third International cropped up in various Latin American countries after 1922, with the international headquarters in Montevideo. Communist adherents were active among the laborers and military and naval personnel. In turn, the alleged existence of communism has been used by Latin American dictators as an excuse

for perpetrating many illegal acts, and has spurred the Roman Catholic Church to determined opposition. Since there is no strong industrialized order here, there is no proletariat in the Russian sense. Communist agents have been quite depressed by the almost complete lack of solidarity among the various exploited groups.

PUBLIC OPINION

Because of the personal or class rule which prevails in practically all the states of Latin America, the role of public opinion is restricted. It obviously sets certain broad limits within which the chief of state must operate or run the risk of being overthrown. However, his unrivalled power makes it unnecessary for him to consult public opinion on particular issues. Where, as in Brazil and Argentina in recent years, there have been no elections and the press is highly censored, even if a public opinion matured on some particular issue it would be difficult to determine how generally or how tenaciously it was held. A serious defect of any totalitarian regime is that those in authority are frequently unable to gauge public opinion even when they are disposed to be guided by it.

Due to the considerable illiteracy which prevails in most Latin American states, the formulation of public opinion—as distinct from the opinion of the upper classes—is little influenced by the printed word. On topics permitted by the censors, the radios and the cinema theaters exercise the major influence in the cities, while among the rural population, opinions spread and mature largely through the medium of the spoken word. However, the use of loud-speaker radio attachments is increasing the influence of the radio, even in rural areas where receiving sets are still comparatively rare.

The opinions of the university students—often radical and nationalistic—exert an influence which might well excite the envy of students in other lands. When public opinion is aroused in Latin American countries and disorders are threatened, the drinking places and the universities are often the first to be closed by the authorities.

On all matters touching Christian doctrine or morality, public opinion is subject to the persistent and effective influence of the Catholic Church. Throughout Latin America, rulers and

forms of government may come and go, but the Church abides. Although in some countries—particularly Mexico and Colombia—there have been at times anti-clerical regimes, there is no Latin American country in which the Church has not been a major factor in the development of public opinion on those topics with which the Church is concerned.¹⁴ In addition, all Latin American governments must reckon with the spirit of fanatical nationalism which, in recent years, has dominated public opinion south of the Rio Grande.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE JUDICIARY

Because of the prevalence of personal rule throughout Latin America there has been little opportunity for the development of either genuine local government or an independent judiciary. Those who have seized control of the central governments are not disposed to have their powers restricted, either by elected local officials or by judges empowered to pass on the legality of their acts. In such federal states as Brazil, Mexico and Argentina, the constituent states are subject to control by the central government. In these republics, chief executives may be appointed by the central governments to administer the affairs of the component states.

Moreover, it has been frequently observed that the Latin Americans, like the Germans and the Italians, were willing enough to abandon their powers of local government, and accept the destruction of the independence of their judiciary, if the ruling dictators retained the confidence of the people. The Chief of the Administrative Department of the important state of São Paulo, who in fact controls the affairs of both the state of São Paulo and its local governments, reported with pride that he and his six associates did the work of the former Chamber and Senate of that state and of all its 171 town councils.¹⁵ In the opinion of most Latin Americans local government which is efficiently administered by appointed agents of the central power is an adequate substitute for local self-government.

¹⁴ For example, it is reported that in Brazil, no text book may question "the inseparability of the marital bond." See Karl Loewenstein, *Brazil Under Vargas* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), p. 293.

¹⁵ Karl Loewenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

PAN-AMERICAN RELATIONS

The relations between the Latin American states, since their independence, have been disturbed because the states only gradually took form and their boundaries were ill-defined. Moreover the poor states envied the richer ones, the small ones feared the larger ones, and each developed a proud and sensitive nationalism which hampered the development of friendly relations with its neighbors. Local and sectional feeling has often prevented the creation of states of optimum size. For example, the island of Haiti still is divided between the state of that name and the Dominican Republic. The small states of Central America have not been able to unite, and the confederation established by Bolivar in northern South America soon disintegrated. Practically every state in Latin America has, at one time or another, been at war with one or more of its neighbors.

The Latin American states, other than Brazil, have throughout most of their history, feared and envied the growing power of the United States—and their fears are understandable. Our armed forces have invaded Mexico on three occasions. During the Mexican War our troops fought their way to Mexico City and imposed a peace which took from Mexico about half her territory. In 1914, because some of our Marines seeking to buy some gasoline landed in a zone of Tampico which was under martial law, a dispute arose which led to our occupation of the port of Vera Cruz. Two years later an expedition under General Pershing was sent into Mexico in a futile effort to find and punish Francisco Villa, whose followers had killed some American citizens in a raid on a New Mexican town.

In addition, our Marines have at times occupied Nicaragua, Haiti and the Dominican Republic. We took Puerto Rico from Spain, separated Panama from Colombia, purchased the Virgin Islands from Denmark, and at times have intervened in the affairs of Cuba. In view of this record, it is not surprising that many Latin Americans came to believe that "el imperialismo Yanqui" was the greatest danger they had to face. Out of this fear has come much of the support for some kind of union of the Spanish speaking states, as a measure of defense against the "giant of the North."

Because Spanish is the language of eighteen of the twenty Latin American republics, efforts have been made to develop a

feeling of solidarity within this group and, to that end, several conferences have been held. However, these nations had, within the century, fought Spain for their independence, and this fact, together with the decline in the prestige of Spain during the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, militated against any union based on their common Spanish culture. Moreover, since the overthrow of the Spanish Republic by Franco, the more liberal Latin Americans have been hostile to the Spanish government. Because the Hispanic American movement has frequently been encouraged by Spain for political and economic reasons, the movement is regarded by many Latin Americans as romantic, clerical and reactionary.

Pan-Americanism, at the political level, has manifested itself in various conferences, beginning with one at Panama in 1826. This conference was called by Simon Bolivar, the famous patriot and liberator who was then President of Colombia. The delegates from the United States arrived only after the conference was ended and the representatives of only a few states attended. Conferences were held again in Peru in 1847, and in 1865 when French intervention in Mexico aroused considerable fear throughout Latin America, but only five nations were represented in 1847, and seven in 1865.

In 1881, James G. Blaine, our Secretary of State, issued a call for a Congress to be held in 1882, but the call had to be cancelled when President Garfield was shot, and Secretary Blaine lost his position in the cabinet. However, in the winter of 1889-1890 a conference met in Washington, attended by representatives of all the American nations except the Dominican Republic. From this beginning came the Pan-American Union, which has held conferences in 1901, 1906, 1910, 1923, 1928, 1933, 1936, 1939, 1940, and 1942.

Space limitations will admit of only a few generalizations concerning the accomplishments of these conferences. The earlier ones were chiefly concerned with formulating resolutions designed to facilitate trade between the member states, cultural exchange, the development of means for the conciliation and arbitration of international disputes and the clarification of international law. In addition conferences of specialists were held to discuss such topics as sanitation, child welfare, postal communications, etc. In addition to the work of the conferences, the

Union arranges for the collection and distribution of commercial information of interest to the member states.

Prior to the Montevideo conference in 1933 the meetings had lacked the spirit of friendliness and confidence they were designed to inspire. Our intervention in the Caribbean region and our "taking" of Panama from Colombia had aroused resentment throughout Latin America. Moreover, the tactless utterances of some of our public men had played into the hands of those who warned against the "Colossus of the North." President Buchanan, in his message to Congress in 1858, wrote as follows: "It is beyond question the destiny of our race to spread themselves over the continent of North America and this at no distant day, should events be permitted to take their natural course." A formal, presidential utterance of this kind could not but arouse fear in Mexico, the Central American states, the Caribbean republics, and the other Latin American states who believed they might be the next to succumb to the overwhelming power of the United States.

The Monroe Doctrine. During much of the time prior to the inauguration of the "Good Neighbor" policy in 1933, the Latin American states sought to modify our interpretation of what came to be called the Monroe Doctrine, first declared by President Monroe in a message to Congress in 1823. The essential paragraphs of that famous document deserve to be quoted here:

"The occasion has been judged proper for asserting . . . that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers . . .

"The political system of the allied powers (Holy Alliance) is essentially different . . . from that of America. We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere. But with the Governments who have declared their independence and manifested it, and whose independence we have on great consideration and just principles acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or in any

other manner, controlling their destiny, than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.”¹⁶

Monroe's message was delivered at a time when we were alarmed at Russia's colonization efforts along the North Pacific coast, and the threat of the members of the Holy Alliance to restore to Spain her lost colonies. Britain had benefited from the increased trade which the independence of Spanish America had made possible, and it was suggested to our ambassador in London that Britain and the United States announce their joint opposition to any program aimed at the reconquest of any of the Spanish American states. Instead of a joint statement, a unilateral declaration was made by President Monroe, and to Britain fell the more important task of reinforcing the Doctrine by maintaining the supremacy of the British fleet. Historians are pretty well agreed that it was the British fleet, rather than the pronunciamiento of the relatively weak United States, which prompted the autocratic states of Europe to abandon any intention of aiding Spain to subdue her rebellious colonies in America. In the earlier years of their independence the Latin American states looked more often to Britain for support than to the United States.¹⁷

The Monroe Doctrine, gratefully received by the Spanish American states at the time of its pronouncement, came into disfavor when it was used to justify our policy of “Creeping Down the Caribbean.” The Spanish American states could hardly think highly of the Monroe Doctrine as a protective device during the years when they were seldom seriously threatened by European aggression. At the same time they were living “under the guns”—so to speak—of the “Colossus of the North,” which took the Panama Canal and at times aroused the fear that it might take everything to the north of it.

The Spanish Americans charged not only that the Doctrine had been perverted by Monroe's successors, but that it had proved ineffective. They pointed to the failure of the United States to protest the use of force by various European states against Haiti during the period from 1869 to 1887. In the name of the Doc-

¹⁶ *Messages and Papers of the Presidents* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896), Vol. 11, pp. 209 *et seq.*

¹⁷ Dexter Perkins, “Monroe Doctrine,” *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, X, 631. A recent discussion of the Monroe Doctrine and its dependence on the British fleet is readily available in Walter Lippmann, *U. S. Foreign Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1943), Ch. III.

trine, ineffective appeals for help were made by Colombia in 1824, by Venezuela, Peru and Ecuador in 1846, by Nicaragua in 1848 and 1849, by Mexico in 1862, and even by Argentina in 1902-1903, in her dispute with Britain over the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands. In the latter case the United States held that British claims to the Falkland Islands antedated the Monroe Doctrine, and that the Doctrine could not be retroactively applied.¹⁸

As a leading student of the subject has observed, the Monroe Doctrine has degenerated into a slogan which has taken deep lodgment in the popular mind, and is constantly invoked by those who know little of its history. Most citizens of the United States do not know how bitterly the Latin American states have resented our later interpretations of the Doctrine. On the other hand foreign scholars find it incredible that a few phrases in a rambling presidential message sent to our Congress more than a hundred years ago should arouse in our people the kind of emotional complex which is often related to "an article of faith." ¹⁹

The Good Neighbor Policy. This policy derives its name from a phrase of President Roosevelt's, but it is much older than its name. The relations between the United States and the Latin American nations had been much improved by the time the seventh Pan-American Conference was convened in Montevideo in 1933. Mexico, which had suffered most from the territorial expansion of the United States, had feared another war might result from her expropriation of oil and farm lands owned by American corporations. However, the appointment of Dwight W. Morrow, long associated with the firm of J. P. Morgan and Co., as our ambassador to Mexico in 1927, resulted in such an improvement of relations that Mexico, ever since, has worked in close harmony with the United States in all matters of foreign policy. The way was further paved for an atmosphere of good feeling at the Montevideo conference by the previous withdrawal of our Marines from Nicaragua and the withdrawal of our opposition to a League of Nations' settlement of a territorial dispute between Colombia and Peru.

¹⁸ For a vigorous and scholarly criticism of the application of the Monroe Doctrine from the Spanish American point of view, see Luis Quintanilla, *op. cit.*, Ch VII.

¹⁹ Dexter Perkins, *op. cit.*, p. 633.

Between the Montevideo Conference of 1933 and the Buenos Aires Conference of 1936, the United States had abandoned all claim to the right of intervention in the internal or external affairs of any other state. It had also abandoned its policy of the non-recognition of revolutionary governments. As we have seen, if revolutions in Latin American states are to be thus discouraged, it might be impossible for the people ever to rid themselves of an unpopular dictator. Our fiscal mission had also been withdrawn from Haiti, and the full sovereignty of Cuba had been restored by the abrogation of the Platt Amendment, by which Cuba had been forced to consent to the intervention of the United States for the preservation of Cuba's independence and the maintenance of orderly government.

In addition to the above, the United States refused to support the claim of various oil companies that the Mexican government had no right to expropriate their properties, especially as they were not paid their full value in cash at the time they were taken over. Instead, our government entered into an agreement with Mexico in November, 1941, by which Mexico agreed to make a token payment of \$9,000,000, and an expert was to be appointed by each nation to determine the total amount due, based, not on the present value of the properties, but on the investments of the companies, less depreciation. The companies refused the settlement, but the two nations proceeded to appoint the experts who fixed the amount due at slightly less than \$24,000,000. This was well below the companies' demands, but, so far as the governments were concerned, the controversy was ended.²⁰

The foregoing are some of the achievements of the famous "Good Neighbor Policy," announced by President Roosevelt in his First Inaugural Address of March 4, 1933. It is predicted that the phrase will become as important in the history of our diplomacy as Washington's reference to "no entangling alliances." It ran as follows:

"In the field of world policy, I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor: the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others—the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." The homely phrase "good neighbor" was readily accepted as a

²⁰ For fuller treatment of this oil controversy, see Samuel Guy Inman, *Latin America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, rev. ed., 1942), pp. 282-287.

convenient slogan which served to indicate the change in our treatment of Latin American nations. It will be noted that the policy, as originally formulated, was not restricted to the Latin American States, but it had more immediate application to them, and they have attributed to it an importance not recognized by many citizens of the United States.²¹

With the entrance of the United States into World War II our Good Neighbor Policy took the form of such an aggressive dispensation of good will—and U.S. dollars—that our neighbors to the South were a little dazed and increasingly disturbed. Loans were made to improve strategic railways and to develop strategic industries. The most precariously-situated dictators, through the miracle of Lend-Lease, built up what were in fact their private little armies. This tended to prevent some possible—and often desirable—revolution.²²

The people of the United States are a little perturbed that our munificence has not resulted in a corresponding amount of gratitude among Latin Americans, but the latter suspect that our policy was “sired by fear rather than affection.”²³ A firm friend of the United States, Professor Hernane Tavares de Sa, after spending two years in the United States, was shocked upon his return toward the end of World War II to find his Brazilian countrymen increasingly resentful of the United States and its people. Many of them feared that the United States would demand the retention of the war bases which were built in Brazil with U.S. funds. Others held us responsible for the inflation and other economic disturbances with which they were afflicted. They resented the lordly spending of our soldiers and civilians in a land where poverty is so acute, and they were irritated by the tactlessness of members of our numerous missions. In short the war-time honeymoon was about over. A sounder policy would be to limit ourselves to the procedure of adjusting our protective tariffs so that the Latin Americans may sell in our domestic

²¹ For a Latin American view of the “Good Neighbor Policy,” see Luis Quintanilla, *op. cit.*, pp. 156 *et seq.*

²² For a more detailed account of the Good Neighbor Policy, written by the man who was largely responsible for it, see Sumner Welles, *The Time for Decision* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944), Ch. 5.

²³ Hubert Herring, “How Now, Good Neighbor?” *The Inter-American*, III (July, 1944), p. 11. The entire article should be read for an excellent summary of the achievements of the Good Neighbor Policy, and the criticism it has engendered in Latin America.

market. It is by this policy that Great Britain, without fuss, fanfare or the expenditure of a single farthing, has acquired more good will in Latin America than the U.S. Treasury has been able to buy.²⁴

LATIN AMERICA AND WORLD WAR II

By 1938, when the representatives of the American republics met at Lima, the impending war was casting its shadow far enough to alarm our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. At that conference he tried to secure approval of a treaty which would provide for an annual meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of all the American republics, at which measures might be formulated for the protection of American territory from outside aggression. Argentina professed to believe that such a treaty was not necessary but did join with all the other republics in subscribing to the Declaration of Lima. Democracy was again eulogized, totalitarianism and racial and religious persecution were condemned, and it was agreed that solidarity should be maintained if the security of any American state was threatened.²⁵

After the expected war began, a meeting of the American foreign ministers was held in October, 1939, at Panama. At that time—incredible as it now seems—all attention was directed to preserving the neutrality of the American republics. Two permanent commissions were authorized, one to deal with economic problems resulting from the war, and the other, composed of international jurists, was directed to study the problems which might arise between the American neutrals and the belligerent powers. A “safety zone” was proclaimed in the waters contiguous to the neutral American states, and the belligerents were requested not to engage in hostilities within this zone. The request was disregarded by all parties concerned.

After the defeat of France another conference of Foreign Ministers was held at Havana in July, 1940. At that time it was feared that Germany might acquire the American colonies of her already defeated enemies, together with those of Britain,

²⁴ For a friendly criticism of the operation of our policy, see Hernane Tavares de Sá, “Camouflage of Harmony,” *The Inter-American*, III (August, 1944).

²⁵ For a more detailed account of the Pan-American Conferences, both prior and subsequent to Pearl Harbor, see Sumner Welles, *op. cit.*, Ch. 18.

whose early defeat was anticipated. It was decided that the American republics could not allow the sovereignty of New World colonies to be altered as a result of the war in Europe, and provision was made for their administration by a nation to be named by an Inter-American Commission if such a transfer were attempted. It was agreed that in an emergency "any of the American republics, individually or jointly with others, shall have the right to act in a manner required for its defense or the defense of the continent." In accordance with that agreement the United States sent troops to Dutch Guiana and to the Dutch island of Aruba where much of the Venezuelan oil is refined. In addition, we established a sort of "protective blockade" around the French island of Martinique.

Shortly after the United States found herself at war, the Latin American states began to break relations with the Axis powers. When Argentina finally took this step in January, 1944, the last diplomatic ties between the Axis and the New World were severed. By the time the United Nations Conference convened in San Francisco in 1945, all of the Latin American states had declared war on the Axis powers.

Of the Latin American states at war, Brazil, by 1944, was the only one which sent troops to Europe, where a Brazilian contingent fought with Gen. Mark W. Clark's Fifth Army in Italy. Several of the other Latin American states performed useful service in combating enemy submarines, providing facilities for United States forces, and increasing the supply of strategic materials for the Allies. Mexico was the only Latin American state to send troops to the Orient where she was represented by a portion of her air force.

Postwar Trends in Hemisphere Unity. Proponents of inter-American cooperation, who had been encouraged by the degree of solidarity attained during the war, had to worry over the tendency toward disunity which began to be apparent in 1946. Signs of a rift between the United States and some of the Latin American nations had started to appear. Two movements were under way to unite the Latin American countries into a bloc that would wean them away from the United States. Both were different in origin and in their primary objectives, but they were similar in their intentions of forging the other American republics into a bloc from which the United States would be excluded. One had as its leader Dr. José Arce, Argentina's delegate

to the United Nations Assembly, who urged the Latin American nations to vote as an independent bloc, without regard to the United States position. The other was the scheme of Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, leader of the powerful Aprista Party in Peru; he advocated a "Latin-American continental unit" that would coordinate the economics of Latin American countries and would offer Latin America the chance of becoming strong "independently of any power."

Conditions favorable to a cleavage had been building up since the end of the war. Reaction from the war's enthusiasm was making itself felt. Non-American influences, relatively inactive during the war, started reasserting themselves. European countries were working hard to reestablish their prestige and commerce. Communists played heavily on the propaganda theme of "Yankee imperialism." Economic troubles that beset nearly all Latin American countries were being blamed, to a greater or lesser degree, on the United States. Inflation was rampant. Goods were scarce and food was short in some of these states. Nations that had piled up dollar balances during the war found themselves unable to spend them for all the United States goods they needed, receiving fewer goods than they expected under assurances given by Washington at the Mexico City Conference of 1945. And rising prices in America were whittling away the purchasing power of the balances.

Meanwhile differences between Washington and Argentina forced postponement of the inter-American conference that was to convene in Rio de Janeiro in 1946. These differences centered around Argentina's half-hearted action against Nazis, but they involved also the animosities between Argentina's President Juan D. Perón and Spruille Braden, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State. Argentina promised in 1945 to expel all German Nazis and to eradicate Nazi business and social influences. But difficulties soon arose between Perón and Braden, then United States Ambassador in Buenos Aires. Perón accused Braden of meddling in Argentina's politics; Braden charged Perón and his associates with evading Argentina's obligations under inter-American agreements because of their Fascist sympathies. The friction increased when Braden, as Assistant Secretary, arranged for the publication of a *Blue Book* charging Argentina's collaboration with the Axis. Perón denounced it as another example of United States intervention. Under President Perón, the Argentine

Government had deported several Nazis, had taken over numerous German businesses and assumed control of various German organizations; but the State Department still contended that Argentina had done only a part of the job and that the Nazis deported were of minor significance.

The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security met at Petropolis, near Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on August 15, 1947. The Treaty was signed in Rio de Janeiro; it consists of twenty-six articles. After condemning war and undertaking not to resort to war in the settlement of disputes between themselves, the signatory powers agreed that they would use the procedures in force in the Inter-American system before referring a dispute to the General Assembly, of the Security Council of the United Nations. They then agreed to assist each other in case of an attack against any one of them, or any attack within the two American continents (including Greenland) and the vast ocean spaces adjacent thereto.

They further agreed (Article 6) that their foreign ministers should confer "if the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America." By thus agreeing to jointly concern themselves with conflicts arising in other continents, the American states, on paper at least, have gone a long way toward providing for unified action in their international relations.²⁶

Because of the role played by the Pan American Union in unifying the policies of its member states, it is significant that, for the first time since its formation, the Pan American Union now has a Latin American as its Director General. Dr. Alberto Lleras of Colombia was elected to the post by the Governing Board of the Union on March 12, 1947, and is to serve until December 31, 1954. This seems to be part of a program designed to remove the impression that the Union is dominated by our State Department.

²⁶ For the complete text of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Rio de Janeiro, September 2, 1947, together with radio addresses of Secretary Marshall and Senator Vandenberg, delivered September 4, 1947, see *Bulletin of the Pan American Union* (October, 1947).

NOTE: For Bibliography see page 570 at end of Chapter Nineteen.

***MEXICO, ARGENTINA,
BRAZIL, CHILE***

LATIN AMERICAN BRAND OF POLITICS

Space limitations preclude individual treatment of each of the twenty Latin American states. Each of them is increasingly self-conscious of its individuality and nationalism, but they are all in different stages of political, social, and economic development. They all profess as loudly as possible a common democratic faith, though, as in the Balkans, such proclamations are more the substance of things hoped for than the evidence of political practices. All, during World War II, avowed a common mistrust of totalitarian theories imported from the Old World (although Vargas of Brazil emulated the theories of state of Salazar's Portugal—as pointed out in the chapter on Portugal). But, the overall picture still remains characterized by dictatorship as a recognized and respectable form of government, though different from the dictatorships of Europe. Even in Central America (apart from democratically inclined Costa Rica) dictatorships prefer to have their power "constitutionally" extended; everywhere except in Colombia, which claims with some justice to be the most democratic of all Latin American states, the governing power is still the monopoly of a small privileged group, based on the solid facts of ignorance and poverty, social and economic distress, and large aboriginal populations. But in recent years, Latin America has become a laboratory of political, social, racial, and economic experimentation. The movement for social regeneration in Chile, Uruguay's political and social innovations, President Vargas' regime in Brazil—all these were evidences of new and vigorous life; even in the Andean Republics of Bolivia and Peru, there are movements for the reincorporation of the native Indian into national life. And Mexico has presented the example of the first genuine social revolution in the New World.

MEXICO

Except for Brazil, Mexico is the largest of the Latin American states in population. It is about one-fourth the size of the United States and has a population of nearly 20,000,000. Of these, approximately 30 per cent are pure Indian, 55 to 60 per cent are mixed Indian-white (mestizo) and 10 to 15 per cent pure white, chiefly of Spanish descent.

Save for its petroleum and its minerals, Mexico is poor in natural resources. Its area is roughly divided as follows: 36 per cent mountains, rivers, lakes, deserts, swamps; 16 per cent forests; 39 per cent sparse pasturage; and 8.5 per cent cultivable land of which 7.5 per cent is cultivated. About 20 per cent of the cultivated land requires irrigation and the remainder depends on an uncertain rainfall. The yield per acre of corn is about one-third of that of Argentina or the United States, and of wheat, about one-half that of Canada or the United States. For several decades it has had to import corn to feed its increasing population.¹

There is no Latin American state whose history is more confusing than Mexico's. The country began its paradoxical-political career with a conservative revolution. The wealthy Creoles resented the liberal reforms granted by the Spanish king, and believed that they would profit from independence. In 1821 their revolution succeeded and the leader, Iturbide, proclaimed himself emperor, a position which he held for eleven months. A long period of confusion followed, marked by the loss of about half of Mexico's territory to the United States in 1848, and the rise to the presidency of Benito Juárez, a pure-blood Indian. He finally succeeded in defeating and executing Maximilian (1867), who had been installed as Emperor of Mexico by French soldiers of Napoleon III and Mexican conservatives.

The period between the death of Juárez (1872) and the rise of the modern revolutionary movement was marked by the long dictatorship of Porfirio Díaz, the mestizo general who governed Mexico with an iron hand from 1876 to 1911, when Francisco Madero loosed the revolution which forced Díaz to flee to France. From 1911 to date the history of Mexico is a history of the quar-

¹ For the poverty of Mexico's natural resources, see Manuel Gamio, "Geographic and Social Handicaps," *The Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Sciences*, CCVIII (March, 1940), pp. 1-11.

rels between the revolutionary leaders, of attempts at counter revolution and the gradual establishment of the not too orderly regime which has continued to the present time. While Juárez saved the country, Díaz (1876-1911) modernized it, building roads, railways, ports, and telegraphs, and suppressing banditry, but left 70 per cent of his people illiterate. The mineral wealth, the oil resources, the industry of the country were for the most part in foreign hands; concentration of landholding had advanced at prodigious speed, and landholding villages had still further decreased in number. Despite their holding some small farms, by 1910 the rural inhabitants of Mexico who had no individual property were probably more numerous than they had been at any previous time in the country's history; of the population that tilled the land, 95 per cent owned none of it and from three-fifths to two-thirds of the people were in debt service. Less than 3,000 families owned nearly one-half of Mexico, and 27 per cent of the area of the Republic had been sold to a few individuals for less than 12 million dollars.

The revolution of 1910 was not inspired by any particular political or revolutionary theories. But unlike that of 1810, it began as a political movement, and ended as a social reformation. Labor wanted relief, the peasant wanted land, and the pent-up passions of the people, the suppressed desires for social liberation, burst into the open. For the next ten years Mexico passed through a cycle of civil wars.

The present Constitution of Mexico was drafted in 1917. It continued the federal system of government, with a president directly elected by the people—a procedure that has never interfered with the plans of Mexican dictators. Its most significant provisions did not deal with governmental institutions, but with the new powers that were granted to the central government. Article 27 declared the state to be the owner of all subsoil wealth, a declaration which later gave rise to serious disputes when the Mexican government enforced it against foreign oil companies which held concessions which they alleged gave them title to the oil beneath their lands.

The same article also provided that only Mexican citizens and Mexican corporations had the right to acquire land and denied churches the right to hold land or make loans on real property. It further declared that villages which had been deprived of the

land which they had formerly held in common (*ejido*) were to have these lands restored to them.

Article 123, for which, tourists will recall, a street in Mexico City has been named, was hailed as the "Magna Charta of Mexican labor." It legalized unions, gave them the right to strike, established an eight-hour day with double time for overtime, made provision for compensating the victims of industrial accidents and industrial disease, prohibited the labor of children under twelve years of age, and granted women workers a month's leave of absence with pay following the birth of a child, etc.

Article 3 declared that all education was to be provided by the government, prohibited any but secular primary education, prohibited foreigners from functioning as priests, required all priests to register with the civil authorities and gave to the states the right to limit the number of priests. This article later gave rise to a bitter conflict between the state and the Catholic Church. Beginning in 1926 the Church refused to conduct services of any kind, and the "sit-down" continued for three years. Rome finally decreed that the clergy should register and since then, the tension has eased.

The revolutionary program, carried on under this Constitution, calling for political democracy, education, land reform, labor organization, nationalism, and limitations on the power of the Church, was put together in somewhat piecemeal fashion; by 1934, it seemed, indeed, that the revolution had run its course. Yet, the revolution was then to enter on its most advanced and active phase. Under President Lazaro Cárdenas (1934-1940), a sincere idealist and a skilful politician, its scope was broadened and its goal made clearer. Land distribution was given a new impetus; in 1930 less than 2,000 individuals still owned one-third of Mexico, but by the end of 1939, the government had distributed 62½ million acres, had embarked on an extensive program of agricultural development, rural education, and public works, and the ideal of the village community operating within a nationally planned agriculture had become more precisely defined. At the same time, while government control of industry and labor had increased, labor organizations had made rapid strides. In 1938, the holdings of foreign oil companies were expropriated.

In December, 1940, President Cárdenas was able to resign his office peacefully to his successor, President Manuel Avila Ca-

macho. That event marked a new stage in the evolution of Mexican democracy, evolving from a colonial to an independent economy, from a semi-feudal to a democratic nation, aiming to Mexicanize the Indian and to make the Mexican master in his own country, and to achieve a sort of economic democracy.

President Camacho was the first head of the state in years who had publicly announced that he was a "believer." On July 7, 1946, Miguel Alemán was elected Mexico's President. A dapper and dynamic attorney, he had been a lifelong worker in what became known as the Party of the Institutional Revolution (PRI). In a country where many presidents had been revolutionary generals, Alemán held no military rank; but he was the son of a revolutionary general. When General Avila Camacho became a Presidential candidate in 1940, he persuaded Alemán, at that time Governor of Veracruz, to serve as his campaign manager. Alemán was credited with swinging Veracruz and other southern states into line. His reward was appointment as Minister of Gobernación, a Cabinet post like that of the United States Secretary of the Interior. He accomplished reforms in the fields of penology and juvenile delinquency. Long before the party conventions, the Confederation of Mexican Workers had indorsed him for the Presidency. It was said during Camacho's 1940 victory and Alemán's own election that fraud was practiced widely, although even his opponents admitted his political skill in influencing hundreds of thousands of voters in both elections.

Alemán's goal was to solve burning internal and external problems. Labor, released from its wartime non-strike pledge, was restless; strikes, brief work stoppages and threats of strikes were frequent. The Army presented a ticklish political problem; it had several hundred too many generals, many of whom had come in during the revolution. Scores were professionally inferior but politically powerful. World trade expansion was one of Alemán's objectives. His policies were to participate in the United Nations, where Mexico was destined to champion the cause of small nations, and to support the inter-American system. Toward the United States, Alemán was expected to be friendly, but it was questionable how far he would go, as distrust and hatred of the United States were widespread in Mexico. Mexico was also expected to be a friend—sometimes almost the only friend—Russia could count upon in this hemisphere. There were strong ideological ties between Russia and many of Mexico's

labor leaders and intellectuals; in his international policy, Alemán was to give weight to these ties.

Political Parties. Political parties, as known in English-speaking countries, have had no place in Mexican history. Those who have been politically active in Mexico—always a minority—have directed their loyalties toward persons, not organizations. Although other parties are permitted, the position of the “official” party is so strong that it has never lost an election and there is little likelihood that it ever will. Other parties may continue their activities, but so far as voting is concerned—and even more important, the counting of the votes—Mexico is a one-party state, governed by a leader who is normally the President. It is, in general, a regime of absolutism—of the executive power.

A partial—and perhaps complete—justification of personal rule in Mexico is that no other form of government is possible until Mexico has won her fight against poverty, illiteracy and the low cultural level of the mass of its citizens. Since the revolution of 1910, the leaders of Mexico have striven with considerable energy to accomplish these reforms. But they have not developed democratic institutions in the Anglo-Saxon pattern, for Mexico is obviously not yet ready for them. However, in spite of her handicaps, both natural and cultural, Mexico has made such progress in recent years as to justify the hope for continued improvement.

ARGENTINA

Argentina, with an area of about 1,000,000 square miles, is the second largest state in Latin America. Its population is slightly less than 14,000,000. Brazil is more than three times as large, both in area and population, and Mexico, though smaller in area, has nearly 6,000,000 more people than Argentina.

Of all the Latin American states Argentina is the most advanced educationally, industrially, and commercially. Her population has the largest percentage of European blood. Her capital, Buenos Aires, with a population approaching two and one-half million, is the largest city in the Southern Hemisphere, and next to Paris the largest Latin city in the world.

Although the Argentinians were leaders in the wars which ended Spanish rule in South America, they were slow to achieve political unity, fix their frontiers and establish a permanent

regime. Jealousy between Buenos Aires and the less developed provinces prevented unification until 1860, when the history of the Argentine Republic may be said to begin. After a period of anarchy and civil war and the ruthless dictatorship of Rosas, Argentina has since advanced with the stride of a giant. With economic progress came also the rise of labor and of a middle class to give increasing liberalization of governmental and political institutions, complicated, however, by the personal character of Argentina's brand of politics.

The Constitution. In drafting their Constitution, the Argentinians were considerably influenced by the experience of the United States. They set up (1853) a federal system of government, at the head of which was to be a President elected by an electoral college. But the President must be a Roman Catholic; he may not be reelected without an intervening six-year period. The executive, administrative and legislative powers of the Argentine President are more numerous and much more comprehensive than are those of the President of the United States. This is partly due to constitutional grants of power and is partly based on constitutional development. In turn, these tendencies have fostered the development of personal and arbitrary rule which has plagued all the Latin American nations. The executive power is shared with a Cabinet of eight Ministers and two heads of secretariats, who are appointed by the President. Senate confirmation of these and other important executive appointments is not required. The Ministers are responsible to the President and not to the Congress even though in past years they have appeared before the Congress for interrogation.

Legislative power is lodged in a Congress of two houses. The Senate of 30 members (two from each of the 14 provinces and two from the federal capital) is elected by the provincial legislatures, also a copy of the original American practice. Their term is six years, and one-third of the membership retires every two years. The Chamber of Deputies has 158 members, chosen by direct popular election (manhood suffrage only), for a four-year term, one half retiring each two years. The Constitution provides for annual sessions running from May 1 to September 30, but it has been the practice of the Congress not to begin its legislative work until the President was ready to present the annual message. This has often delayed the opening of congressional sessions as much as three or four weeks. Of the 158 deputies, 32 are elected

from the city of Buenos Aires and 42 by the Province of Buenos Aires. This indicates the extent of control which this city and province have over the political affairs of the entire nation.

The judicial branch of the government is composed of a Supreme Court, which resembles that of the United States in both powers and organization, and inferior federal courts. In normal times, the provinces have a governmental organization, including executive, legislative, and judicial departments, closely resembling the government of an American state.

Because the Presidential office is so powerful, political activity in Argentina has taken the form of struggles between the party bosses—and at times the army leaders—to secure it. Those who have controlled the Presidency largely controlled the elections and they could therefore be removed only by revolution or threats of revolution (such as occurred in 1890, 1893, 1904, 1930, and 1943).

The Rise of Perón. In 1943, Argentina was ripe for another *coup*; the people were disgusted with years of public graft. On June 4, the Campo de Mayo garrison seized the Government; pro-Allied General Arturo Rawson became President, but soon was succeeded by General Pedro P. Ramírez, whom the *GOU* (Group of United Officers, a lodge of majors and colonels) supported. The regular constitutional guarantees and the constitutional governmental organization were suspended. The Congress was dissolved, all provincial and municipal governments intervened, and the totality of political power and authority was lodged in the military group which planned and carried through the revolution.

The situation also produced the rise of Perón who, first behind the scenes and then as an office holder, rose like a meteor in Argentina's politics. Juan D. Perón, before his graduation as a second lieutenant in 1913 at the age of 18, had made good marks and won minor honors in writing and dramatics. In the following years he served with troops, held staff and teaching assignments and found time to write half a dozen volumes on military history. Just before the outbreak of the war in Europe, he went to Italy to study mountain warfare. When he sailed for home from Spain, in 1941, he was enthusiastic over what he called "the crusade for spiritual renovation." He soon was spreading this doctrine in Argentina, particularly among his associates in the *GOU*. Under Ramírez he became Argentina's first Secretary of

Labor and Social Welfare; later he also held the posts of Minister of War and Vice-President. Under his guidance, the government gave many workers higher wages and better living conditions and established a civil service. And his star continued to rise during the closing days of World War II.

The maneuvers, international and domestic, of the Argentine's government during 1945 kept the country on the front pages of the world press much of the time. The year began with attention on the international position of Argentina and closed with questions of domestic concern holding the center of the stage. Late in 1944, the Argentine government requested that the Pan-American Union examine the Argentine's "situation" in an attempt to ascertain whether or not that country was living up to its inter-American obligations and commitments. This examination precluded, however, any discussion of domestic policy or action, so often the cause of the failure of that government to comply with what was believed by many American nations to be its inter-American responsibilities. But certain domestic events produced this very difficulty, especially Argentina's new military conscription program, a step which caused apprehension among many of Argentina's neighbors. On Jan. 8, 1945, the Pan-American Union voted to reject Argentina's request for a consideration of her case, and she was not invited to attend a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at Mexico City on Feb. 15, 1945, to discuss war and postwar problems.

The Conference of Mexico City passed the so-called Act of Chapultepec, by which the American Republics agreed to aid each other against aggressive acts even though made by an American state; this proposal, obviously aimed at Argentina, was introduced by Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay. Another declaration provided that Argentina could re-enter into the good graces of the American states if it would "cooperate with the American nations by identifying itself with the common policy." Exactly one week later Perón secured the declaration of war against Germany, but a police edict forbade any celebration of the fall of Berlin. In May, 1945, Argentina was admitted into the United Nations, in spite of Russia's objections. Heartened by this action, the government increased its tempo and vigor of its campaign against all opponents and a new wave of arrests took place.

Another military *coup* headed by General Avalos took place

in October, 1945. But Perón soon thereafter started his campaign for the Presidency and again became the dominant power in the government, although he held no office. Formation of the *Laborista* (Labor) Party followed. The Party nominated him for President, and a wing of the Radical Party supported him.

In the election of Feb. 26, 1946, Perón defeated his opponent, José P. Tamborini, in spite of the public denunciation of him by the United States Department of State, which published an American *Blue Book* describing Argentina's collaboration with Nazi Germany. Once installed as President, Perón soon started to purge the judiciary, the only branch of government which might possibly oppose him. His basic charge in the impeachment proceedings was that the justices acted illegally when they recognized the *de facto* governments established by revolutions in 1930 and 1943. Opponents of the proceedings characterized the impeachment as "an act of political vengeance." He then proceeded to stifle critics and opponents of his dictatorship in private life by harassment, economic pressure, intimidation and, if these failed, by open violence. The universities were purged of anti-Perón professors, lecturers and researchers, or closed altogether. A number of newspapers were suspended and others were forced to change their editorial policies by constant harassment and unfair discriminations that threatened them with financial ruin.

Perón's regime had to face also Communist boring from within, although Perón's inauguration as President, followed closely by the establishment of diplomatic and trade relations with Soviet Russia, led to what appeared to be an understanding between Perón and the Communists. Revived after having been barred for fifteen years, the Communist Party regarded Perón as a Fascist, but supported some of his policies. At any rate, they started boring from within to gain control of organized labor, the principal source of Perón's electoral support. The party's move in 1946 to dominate the General Federation of Labor (CGT), controlled by the Government, was the most important phase of a campaign for increased strength and influence. When Perón was running for the Presidency, the Communists joined with the Radicals, the Conservatives and the Socialists in opposing him and supporting José P. Tamborini. But after Perón's inauguration, their policy was to move in on the labor unions and to support the Government on some of its policies. Perón, for his part, made no attempt to conceal his dislike for the Communists and

declared that he considered communism the greatest threat to the western democracies. To labor, Communists based their appeal on the theme of "working-class unity," and were winning considerable strength in the railway and packing-house unions and in the building trades; toward the United States, they had abandoned their wartime support, and started making almost daily attacks on the United States and Britain; President Truman was caricatured as the symbol of "yanqui imperialism," and his plan for the defense of the hemisphere was condemned as a device to place Latin America under United States control.

Favoring the Argentine Communists was the greatly increased cost of living, and the growth of communism in neighboring Brazil and Chile; freedom to carry on party activities legally; Russia's growing prestige in Latin America and the ancient anti-U.S. feeling that has always existed in Argentina. Strongest handicaps to the Communists were the facts that Argentina is solidly Catholic and Argentina's standards of living for city dwellers were higher than those in any other country in Latin America. Argentina's pride of nationality and resentment toward alien ideologies were other handicaps.

Perón's career and his brand of politics were typical of the political dynamics characterizing that part of the world: the army historically identified with both progressive and reactionary movements, headed by a "strong man" seeking power by proclaiming ideological principles.

BRAZIL

Brazil, with an area larger than the United States, has a population in excess of forty-four million. More than one-third of all Latin Americans live in Brazil and their Portuguese language and culture, together with the immensity of the land they occupy, set them apart from their Spanish-speaking neighbors.

The history of Brazil also differs in many important respects from that of the other South American countries. During the Napoleonic wars, the King of Portugal fled to Brazil, and after his return to Europe, his eldest son was proclaimed Emperor of the independent state of Brazil (1822). The Empire of Brazil continued until 1889, when revolutionists established a republic under the name of the United States of Brazil. The reigning

Emperor, Pedro II, was unwilling to fight for his crown and embarked peaceably for Europe. In this way the Brazilians gained their independence without a struggle, while most of the Spanish colonies fought for years with Spain, and with each other, before their independence was firmly established.

Brazil, unlike such countries as Mexico and Peru, had no large Indian population when European settlement began. To obtain workers the Portuguese sugar planters began importing Negro slaves from Africa and it is estimated that by the end of the eighteenth century the slaves outnumbered the whites in Brazil by 50 per cent.² Since that time the large migration of whites from Europe has reduced the proportion of Negro blood, but save for the United States, Brazil has the largest Negro population of any country in the New World. However, as a result of the racial tolerance which has always been a feature of Brazilian folkways, the presence of Negroes in Brazil has not given rise to the racial problems with which we are confronted.

The "crowned democracy" of Brazil offered in the 19th century a marked contrast to her neighbors. Under the benign rule of the scholar-emperor, Pedro II, the country enjoyed the reputation of being the most enlightened and liberal of the Latin American States until, in 1889, a bloodless revolution prepared the way for the federal republic.

When the Republic was established (1889), a Constitution was adopted which was patterned in many respects after our own. A state which, since its inception, had been a unified one, was suddenly transformed into one based on federal principles. This of course reversed the process in North America, where the separate existence of the colonies came first and they were later to create a federal state to which only limited powers were given. It is frequently argued that this "splintering" of a previously unified Brazil encouraged regional jealousies and the development of local bosses, which facilitated the overthrow of the democratic Republic in 1930 by a benevolent dictator, Doctor Getulio Vargas.

The establishment of the Republic was followed by great economic advancement, but politically the consequences were less happy. In 1929 the world crisis destroyed both the political and

² A. Curtis Wilgus, *The Development of Hispanic America* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941), p. 228; Gilberto Freyre, *The Masters and the Slaves* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1946).

economic systems, and President Vargas, who came into power in 1930, established the nearest approach to a totalitarian state in the New World. Trained in law, he had served in the state and federal legislature, and was Minister of Finance before becoming Governor of his state in 1928. He was reputed to be a good administrator, honest, and efficient. The fact that he did not come from one of the aristocratic families may have accounted for his apparent interest in improving the conditions of the common people. When, in 1930, he was defeated in an election "not more fraudulent than previous ones," as the Liberal Party's candidate, he led a revolt, suspended the Constitution and remained in power until 1946.³

Vargas' Regime. His regime did not fit readily into any of the conventional classes of government. In form it was a pure dictatorship, unrestrained by constitutional restrictions or popular elections. Yet the most significant features of European totalitarianism were absent in Brazil; and the *Estado Novo* (New State), President Vargas maintained, was exclusively Brazilian, aiming at the establishment of Brazilian unity, at the exploitation of Brazil's great natural resources, at the development of the interior, and at social and economic reform. It also lacked the mysticism, the intolerance and the persecutions which characterized Fascist regimes in Europe. More important, perhaps, to the United States and the United Nations, Brazil, as the largest of the South American states and the one most friendly to us, fought on our side.

Passing of Vargas. In 1945 Vargas allowed general elections, the first in fifteen years, and announced his support of General Eurico Gaspar Dutra for President. A new political party, called the Social Democratic Party, backing General Dutra for President, and advocating more private capital development of industry, a federal democratic form of government, free education and protection of labor, was formed. On October 30, Vargas resigned or was forced to resign as President and the office was turned over to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. On Nov. 12, 1945, a decree was issued granting "unlimited powers" as a Constituent Assembly to the Congress to be elected, and providing that when it had drafted the new Constitution and this had been approved, Congress would become an ordinary legislative body.

³ For a detailed analysis of Vargas' dictatorship, see Karl Loewenstein, *Brazil Under Vargas* (New York: Macmillan, 1942).

General Dutra was elected as a matter of routine to the Presidency in December. Brazil's new Constitution, adopted in the ninth month of Dutra's Presidency, provided far more elbow room than was permissible under the fifteen-year Vargas dictatorship. It gave Congress a broader range of action, removed restrictions on freedom of religion, speech and thought, and reestablished the federal union of states which Vargas had dissolved in favor of a centralized form of government. On paper, at least, Congress had a broader range and states regained all powers which Vargas took away. The Constitution outlawed parties "whose program is contrary to a democratic regime." Communists, already at odds with Dutra, fought that tooth and nail, but lost out. The new charter also prohibited divorce, barred foreigners from engaging in coastwise commerce or owning stock in newspapers or radio stations. To safeguard the freedom of the press, newsmen were exempted from income tax.

But the achievement of more freedom did not solve Brazil's biggest problem—hardening of the economic arteries. Wages were low, and prices were sky-high—up 300 per cent on some items. Food was scarce, especially flour, bread, cheap cuts of meat, butter, lard. Transportation was the biggest headache; for the lack of it, thousands of tons of food were rotting on the ground in the interior. Dutra's political difficulties stemmed also from the adoption in 1946 of a new Constitution, replacing the totalitarian charter of President Getulio Vargas' "new state." Political cleavages, legal after fifteen years of oppression under Vargas, were feeding on the economic unrest. Integralists—Fascists who had attempted to seize the government in 1938—were active as the result of the return from exile of their leader, Plinio Salgado. Communists were capitalizing on discontent to increase their numbers, already greater than in any other Latin American country. If the Army continued to support the Constitution (and it had been the Army which had engineered the ouster of Vargas in 1945 so that democratic elections could take place), it was expected that Dutra could work out his difficulties.

CHILE

Chile, like Brazil, enjoyed a reputation for stability during the nineteenth century, ruled by a landed aristocracy which con-

trolled something approaching a parliamentary system. This oligarchy of power, wealth and education had its way until the rise of industry, labor, and a middle class created new social and political problems. Economic dislocation of the 1920's, the disappearance of the nitrate market and its effects on the public revenues, social distress, and the efforts to meet these problems resulted in revolution and dictatorship.

The geographical aspects of the country have determined to a remarkable degree the political struggles. A more complete contrast between the northern desert and the cold, rain-swept south would be difficult to find. Both have an inhospitable climate, both are sparsely settled, and both have been regarded, at various periods of national development, as holding the promise of the future. But whereas the north has been explored and developed, the promise of the far south is yet to be exploited. The "real Chile" is the Central Valley that extends from the Aconcagua River basin to the Bío-Bío River, a distance of about 500 miles. Population, economic life, government, and culture are concentrated in this region—agricultural to the core.⁴

Until 1925, when a new Constitution was adopted, the outstanding political issue was the struggle of the propertied classes to retain the government as a vehicle of their particular interests, as the authoritarian Constitution of 1833 had intended. During the first century of Chile's independence, the land-owning agrarian interests, located in the heart of the country, ruled national institutions. The postwar trends, characterized by the rising middle class, which the mining and manufacturing industry had brought into being, reinforced by class-conscious workers in the nitrate fields, the copper and coal mines, and the new industrial centers, produced (between the two World Wars) five military coups, three dictatorships, and one popular revolution.

Basically, it was the conflict between the interest of the landed proprietor and landless worker who—uprooted and disoriented—sought a place and voice in national affairs. The depression of 1931-1932, the disastrous earthquake of 1938, and the dislocations produced by World War II intensified the struggle in the welter of the incurable factionalism of Chilean political parties, whose large number resembles European countries rather than any

⁴ Olive Holmes, "Chile: Microcosm of Modern Conflicts," *Foreign Policy Reports*, XXII, No. 9 (July 15, 1946), pp. 106-16, is the best recent short survey of Chile's problems.

other Latin American nation. They could be, however, grouped as follows: the Conservative Party of the aristocracy is distinguished from the Liberal Party by its fidelity to the Church. The Liberals, since the religious question has been resolved, do not differ on fundamental issues from the Conservatives. Both the Conservatives and Liberals are the most influential among those representing the agrarian interests. Within this framework, in turn, the parties of the Right range from the ultra-reactionaries, who would like to return to the "Portalesian democracy" of the past century (a period characterized by decorum and circumspect regard for Church and property), to the Popular Christian Party of younger men promoting social and economic reforms on the basis of the Papal Encyclicals.

The balance-wheel of the Leftist coalition, and possibly the strongest party, is the Radical Party of the center, representing the middle class together with a wing of southern agriculturists, opposed to the influence wielded by the landowners of the central provinces. Like the Liberal Party, whose branch it was, it favored the separation of Church and State, which was accomplished in the 1925 Constitution. The presence of wealthy landowners and industrialists in the Party prevents the Party from developing any definite policy. An offshoot of the Radicals is the Party of the Democrats, which does not differ from the Radical Party's platform; originally the spokesman of the working class, it now represents the lower middle class. In the Leftist grouping, the Socialist Party is second in importance and has to compete with the Communist Party (which left it in 1932), for supremacy in the Chilean Federation of Labor.

The vicissitudes of the successive governments formed by the Popular Front and the Democratic Alliance show the inherent difficulties confronting any Chilean government which tries to effect basic reforms. The basic problem is the inability of the land to support a rapidly increasing population.

The Popular Front, a loose coalition of the Left parties, formed the government in 1938 after overturning the previous Conservative administration in a national election. The new President, Pedro Aguirre Cerda, was however unable to retain the support of the Left alliance; then came the earthquake of 1938 and World War II. President Cerda, who died in 1941, was replaced by Juan Antonio Ríos, of the Democratic Alliance, an electoral coalition of the Leftist parties which, again, was plagued by con-

tinuing party strife, the reflected policies of Spain and Argentina hostile to the United States, and those of Chilean labor vociferously favoring the United States. The situation was complicated further by the influence of numerous and influential Chileans of German descent. Hence, except Argentina, Chile was the last Latin American nation to break diplomatic relations with the Axis.⁵

The election of March 4, 1945, resulted in gains for the Conservatives, Liberals, Independents, and Agrarians, giving them a majority of one in the Senate, although the Leftist government coalition parties claimed a majority in the Chamber of Deputies.⁶ In November, 1945, President Ríos withdrew from the government; this happened almost simultaneously with the termination of United States war contracts for Chilean copper. In January, 1946, Acting President Alfredo Duhalde had to suppress firmly a strike on the part of Communist-dominated nitrate unions.

In the Presidential elections, September 4, 1946, Dr. Gabriel González Videla, liberal, was candidate of a group of Leftist parties that included the Communists. Although first in a field of four candidates, he failed to win the majority necessary for election. Under the Constitution, the National Assembly was to choose between him and the second highest candidate. The latter, however, refused to press his case. His coalition administration, in which Conservative elements were to be included and appeased (although they had opposed him) and used to counterbalance Communist influence, started to take shape in the fall of 1946.

A hard job was ahead of González. Chile's economic difficulties run deep and her political alignments are shaken easily.

TRENDS AFTER WORLD WAR II

Since the end of World War II, most Latin American countries have experienced inflation, and many of them have nearly

⁵ Chile signed the United Nations Declaration on February 14, 1945.

⁶ The Constitution of 1925 provides for a President chosen for a term of six years by popular vote. Legislative power is vested in a Congress of two Houses—the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate of 45 members is elected for eight years, the Chamber of Deputies of 143 members for four years, by suffrage of all male citizens over 21 years of age who can read and write. Women and foreigners of five years' residence have the vote in municipal elections.

depleted their dollar reserves. During the war years, the dollars earned by these countries could not be spent because the products they wanted were not available for export. With the end of the War, our exports to Latin America rapidly increased to the highest level ever reached, but it is doubtful if this level can be maintained.

For example, in July, 1947, the Mexican government, faced with a decline in its dollar reserves, placed an embargo on the importation of luxury goods. The list of forbidden imports included automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, jewelry, furs, clothing, pianos and cosmetics. On certain semi-luxury goods, the import duties were raised. It was estimated that 90 per cent of all such goods came from the United States.⁷ Other Latin American countries have taken similar action.

Political Developments. In the postwar years, several Latin American states have experienced what has been called "the wave of reaction . . . set in motion by the greater tide moving up from Argentina."⁸ Following the admission of Argentina to the United Nations—with the support of the United States—Colonel Perón, as President of his country, seems to have thoroughly consolidated his authoritarian regime.

It may be misleading to call the Argentine regime a Fascist one, because that word has come to be an epithet rather than a descriptive term. To understand it and the similar regimes which emerge so frequently in Latin America, an ounce of description is sometimes worth a pound of ideological analysis. For instance, the position of independent intellectuals in authoritarian states is illustrated by Perón's treatment of Dr. Bernardo Houssay, co-winner of the Nobel Prize in Medicine for 1947. In 1943, Professor Houssay, together with about five thousand other intellectuals, signed the now famous "Manifesto For Effective Democracy." His name was one of a hundred and fifty signers whose names appeared in the press, and all of them were promptly dismissed from the public service. By 1945, when it appeared that the expectations of an Axis victory were ill founded, and Argentina sought to improve its relations with the victors, the decree of dismissal was revoked. However, Perón could never forgive Dr. Houssay, and when he was attending a

⁷ *Pan American Bulletin* (September, 1947), p. 512.

⁸ Del Vayo, "Reaction in Latin America," *The Nation* (June 7, 1947), p. 687.

scientific meeting in Canada, in 1946, he was once more dismissed from his university post.

When it was announced that he had been adjudged co-winner of the Nobel Prize in Medicine, the governmental organ *Epoca* declared that the prize was given him "on political grounds." A Senate of one of the Argentine states congratulated him on being the first Latin American to win such a prize. It was announced that the Senate was being investigated for "conduct exceeding legislative duties."⁹

Opposition to Communism. On May 7, 1947, Brazil's Supreme Electoral Tribunal held that the Brazilian Communist Party was illegal, since its doctrines were "absolutely contrary to the concept of democracy set forth in the Brazilian Constitution." The Party had regained legal status in 1945, and had won eighteen seats in the National Congress, eighteen seats in the City Council of Rio de Janeiro, and sixty seats in state legislatures.¹⁰

The psychology of an authoritarian, nationalistic regime is well illustrated by the decision of an Argentine court that a birth certificate could not be issued to a baby in the name of Ingrid Elizabeth. The court held that Isabel, the Spanish equivalent of Elizabeth, must always be used in its stead. Foreigners are obligated to give Argentine names to children born in Argentina.¹¹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BEALS, CARLETON, *The Coming Struggle for Latin America* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1938). A critical survey of Latin American governments and our policies toward them.

Bulletin of the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C. This monthly publication, which appears in Spanish, Portuguese and English editions, is almost indispensable for the serious student of Latin America. Being an official publication, it never contains material which would give offense to any member state, but it is completely reliable.

BRYCE, JAMES, *South America* (New York: Macmillan, 1913). A profound analysis which has never been superseded.

⁹ Vincent de Pascal, "Houssay of Argentina," *United Nations World* (January, 1948), p. 22.

¹⁰ *Pan American Bulletin* (August, 1947), p. 453.

¹¹ *United Nations World* (May, 1947), p. 65.

- CALDERON, F. G., *Latin America* (London: Fisher, Unwin, 1918). A widely quoted critical work by a distinguished Latin American.
- FREYRE, GILBERTO, *Brazil* (New York: Knopf, 1945). A Brazilian sociologist analyzes the effect of his country's mixed racial heritage on its historical development and its prospects for the future. He very definitely does not hold with the racial snobs, for he finds in mixture a source of national strength rather than of weakness. The substance of this book consists of lectures originally delivered at Indiana University.
- GRUENING, ERNEST, *Mexico and Its Heritage*. (New York: Century, 1928). A readable, detailed and authentic account.
- HICKS, ALBERT C., *Blood in the Streets* (New York: Creative Age Press, 1946). The thoroughly unsavory record of Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, including his strong-arm tactics against Haiti, is here exposed to the public gaze; the author is a journalist with experience in the Caribbean.
- INMAN, SAMUEL GUY, *Latin America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1942). A standard work by a prolific writer in the field.
- JAMES, PRESTON E., *Latin America* (New York: The Odyssey Press, 1942). A definite work on the geography and democracy of Latin America.
- LOEWENSTEIN, KARL, *Brazil Under Vargas* (New York: Macmillan, 1942). A scholarly, impartial report.
- SCHURZ, WILLIAM L., *Latin America* (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1942). One of the best of the recent books on Latin America.
- SMITH, T. LYNN, *Brazil: People and Institutions* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1946). A sociological analysis by a prominent American sociologist.
- United Nations World*, New York. This relatively new periodical is a good source for current developments in Latin America. It is independent, and can therefore print interviews, news and notes that could not appear in an official publication.
- WILGUS, A. C., *The Development of Hispanic America* (New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1941). A history—and a good bibliography.
- WILLIAMS, MARY W., *The People and Politics of Latin America* (Boston: Ginn, rev. ed., 1945). An authentic and readable history.

INDEX

- Abdul Hamid II, 518
 Abetz, Otto, 128
 Abolition of German Federal System, 167-168
 Adamic, Louis, 436
 Administrative agencies, British, 33-34
 Administrative divisions, British, 35-36
 Adolphus, Gustavus, 321
 Adrianople, Treaty of, 415, 483
 Alemán, Miguel, 558
 Alexander, A. V., 93
 Alexander, of Greece, 494
 Alexander I, Yugoslavia, 442, 444, 447-449
 Alexander II, Russia, 194, 196
 Alexander of Battenberg, Prince, 463
 Alfonso XIII, Spain, 273-275
 Alibert, Raphael, 121
 Allegre, Rafael Sanches, 274
 Allied Advisory Council (for Italy), 254
 Allied Commission (AC), 253-254, 258
 Allied Control Council (ACC), 181-186, 188, 253
 Allied Military Government (AMG), 187, 190-190d, 252-253, 256, 259
 American aid, *see* Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan
 AMFOGE (Allied Commission for Observing the Greek Elections, 501
 Anarcho-Syndicalist Party, Spain, 276
 Anglican legal system, 51-55
 Antonescu, Ion, 417; dictator, 428
 Arce, Dr. José, 551
 Argentina, constitution, 560-561; geopolitics, 559-560; judiciary, 561; political parties, 561-563
 Armed forces, Italy, 248; Third Reich, 176-177; Russia, 217
 Armistice, Hungarian, 400
 Army, reconstruction of the French, 142; Swiss, 312-313
 Arrese, José Luis de, 282
 Asquith, 24-25
 Assembly of the French Union, 111
 Assize, 54
 Association of Czech Youth, 382
 Ataturk, Kemal, 520; regime of, 521-524
 Atlantic Charter, 58-59, 66, 81, 93
 Attlee, Clement, 27, 30
 Attorney-General, British, 41
 Aurelian, Emperor, 413
 Auriol, Vincent, 147
 Australia, 73-75
 AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Emergency Parliament), 455
 Axis, Greece under the, 496-497
 Azaña, Manuel, 277
 Badoglio, Marshal Pietro, 251, 254, 255
 Bagehot, Walter, 9, 41
 Bakunin, Mikhail, 195-196
 Baldwin, Stanley, 25-26
 Balfour, Lord, 98
 Balkans, politics of the, 406-409
 Baltic States, geopolitics, 343-344; history, 345
 Bank of England, 61-62
 Barth, Karl, 172
 Beerhall Putsch, 157
 Beneš, Dr. Eduard, 363-367, 368, 371, 377; government of, 379-384, 386b-386c
 Bentham, Jeremy, 9
 Bernadotte, House of, 322
 Bethlen, Count, 397
 Beveridge, Sir William, 59, 60, 61
 Bevin, Ernest, 101, 108
 Bidault, Georges, 147
 Bierut, Boleslaw, 353
 "Big Business," Portuguese, 295
 "Big Seven" of Yugoslavia, 454
 Bill of Rights, English, 13
 Bismarck, 152

- Blackstone, Sir William, 52
 Blaine, James G., 544
Blue Book, 552, 563
 Blum, Léon, 147
 Board of Trade, British, 31, 32, 35
 Bodnares, Emil, 432
 Boer War, 77-78
 Bonomi, Ivanoe, 255-259
 Bonomi Coalition Cabinets, 255-259
 Boris, King, 463, 465, 472-474
 Bormann, 165
 Botha, Louis, 77, 78
 Braden, Spruille, 552
 Brasio, Marilio, 259
 Bratianu, George, 429
 Bratianu, Ion I. C., 419-420
 Bratianu, First, 419; Second, 420; Third, 421-422
 Brazil, constitution, 565-566; geopolitics, 564-566; political parties, 566-567
 Brinon, Fernand de, 130
 Britain, cabinet, 14, 30-31; constitution, 10-15; empire government, 67-69; geopolitics, 1-7; history, 3-7; judiciary, 51-55; political parties, 20-27
 British Colonies, 103-107
 British Commonwealth of Nations, 64-69
 British East India Company, 89
 British India, 88-89, 95-95a
 British rule in India, 89-92; end of, 95-95a
 Brown Shirts, 158
 Broz, Josip, *see* Tito
 Bruening, 155
 Budget procedure, British, 48-49
 Buenos Aires Conference, 548
 Bulgaria, constitution, 464; geopolitics, 458; history, 462-463; political parties, 474-477d; under Russia, 474
 Burke, Edmund, 11
 Burma, 69, 95a, 97-98
 Byrnes, James F., 404
- Cabinet, Britain, 14, 30-31; Denmark, 332-333, 338a; Estonia, 356; Finland, 336; Germany, 164-165; Latvia, 356; Lithuania, 355; Norway, 327; Poland, 349-350; Sweden, 322
- Calinescu, 427
 Camacho, Manuel Avila, 558
 Campbell-Bannerman, 24
 Canada, 69-73
 Cantons, government of Swiss, 310-311
 Cape of Good Hope Province, 77
 Capodistrias, Count John, 483
 Cárdenas, Lazaro, 557
 Carlists, 271, 276, 278, 283
 Carmona, General Antonio Oscar de Fragoso, 293
 Carol I, Romania, 410, 415, 419
 Carol II, Romania, 411, 413, 417, 420; rule of, 422-423; dictator, 426-428
 Casablanca Conference, 132
 Caste system of India, 87
 Catherine II, Russia, 482
 Caudillo, El (Spanish Chief of State), 279, 281
 Cavour, 231, 232
 Central Criminal Court, London, 54
 Central Legislature of India, 91, 92
 Cerda, Pedro Aguirre, 569
 Cession, Polish to Russia, 354-355
 Ceylon, 95b
 Chalkovsky, Dr. Frantisek, 377
 Chamberlain, H. S., 160
 Chamberlain, Neville, 26-27, 30, 106, 365
 Chamber of Deputies, Italy, 237-241
 Chancelleries, Germany, 164
 Chancellor of the Exchequer, British, 39, 48
 Chapultepec, Act of, 562
 Charles, King, Romania, 415
 Charles I, England, 12
 Charter of Labor, French, 126
 Chartists, British, 14, 22
 Chernyshevsky, N. G., 195-196
 Chetniks, 451-452
 Chifley, Joseph B., 75
 Child health, British, 59
 Chile, constitution, 568-569; geopolitics, 568; political parties, 569
 Christian X, Denmark, 332
 Church, in Franco Spain, 285; in Portugal, 295
 Churchill, Winston, 23, 24, 27, 30, 86, 93, 131, 268, 353, 430, 499, 500
 Citizen Rights, Russia, 215

- Civil Code, Turkish, 520
 Civil Service, Britain, 34-37; purge of the German, 165; Third French Republic, 123; Switzerland, 307
 Civil War, Greece, 499; Spain, 278-279
 Clann Na Talmhan (Farmer's Party), 86
 Clark, General Mark W., 132
 Clay, General Lucius, 184
 Clementis, Vlado, 386
 Clive, Robert, 89
 Cobbett, William, 16
 Codreanu, Zelea, 427
 Colonial Empire, British, 103-107
 Colonial Office, British, 103-107
 Comenius, 367
Cominform, 227c
 Commissariats, in Russia, 212-213; in the Third French Republic, 123
 Committee of National Liberation, French, 133, 257
 Committee of the Whole House, 46, 49
 Commons, House of, 14, 41-44
 Commonwealth of Great Britain, 64-67
 Communes, France, 123-124, 138-139; Switzerland, 311
 Communist coup d'état, Czechoslovakia, 386b-386f
 Communist ideology, 199-200
 Communist Party, Russia, 205-208
 Communists, Argentina, 563-564, 567; Bulgaria, 469-470, 474-477b; Czechoslovakia, 371, 381, 385-386f; France, 148a-148b; Greece, 504-504b; Hungary, 400-405b; Italy, 264b; Latin America, 540-541; Poland, 360-360b; Romania, 431-432, 434-434b, revolutionary, 202; Yugoslavia, 455-456b
Concilium Privatum, 32
 Condouriotis, Admiral, 484
 Congress of Vienna, 231
 Congress Party, *see* Indian National Congress Party
 Conservative Party, British, 18-27
 Constantine, King, Greece, 483, 493, 494
 Constituent Assembly, 145-147
 Constituent republics of U.S.S.R., 213
 Constitution, Argentina, 560-561; Brazil, 565-566; Britain, 10-15; Bulgaria, 464-465; Canada, 70; Czechoslovakia, 367-368; Denmark, 331-332, 335-336; Estonia, 347-348, 357; France, 111-113, 145-148a; Germany, 163-169; Greece, 484-485, Hungary, 394; India, 93-95; Italy, 229, 232-233, 264-264a; Latvia, 348, 357, Lithuania, 346-347, 356-357; Mexico, 556-557; Norway, 327; Poland, 345-346; Romania, 416-417; Russia, 209-218, Sweden, 322-325; Switzerland, 297, 300-302, 308-309; Turkey, 519-520, 523-524; Vichy regime, 120-125; Yugoslavia, 442-443, 453-454
 Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), Canada, 72
 Corporations, Italy, 246
 Corporative system, Italy, 245-248
 Costello, John, 95b
 Council of Nationalities, 211
 Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., 212
 Council of States, Swiss, 303
 Council of the Union, Russia, 211
 County Courts, British, 53
 Court of Appeal, British, 41, 53
 Courts of Petty Sessions, 53
 Courts, in the Vichy Government, 122-123
 Cripps, Sir Stafford, 92-93
 Cristea, Dr. Miron, 427
 Cromwell, Oliver, 12
 Crown, Spanish, 272
Curia Regis, 32, 37
 Curtin, John, 75
 Cuza, Colonel Alexandry Ion I., 415, 427
 Czechoslovakia, Communist expansion in, 386a-386f; constitution, 367-368; geopolitics, 365-366; history, 366-367; judiciary, 377; political parties, 369-376, 381-383
 Daladier, Edouard, 116
 Damaskinos, Archbishop, 500
 Darányi, 397
 Darlan, Admiral, 121, 127-128, 132-133
 Darnand, Joseph, 124
 Darré, Walter, 172
 Déat, Marcel, 125, 130

- de Brinon, Fernand, 130
 de Gaulle, General Charles, 112, 130, 132-133, 136, 145-146
 de la Torre, Victor Raúl Haya, 552
 de Montfort, Simon, 37
 Denmark, cabinet, 332-333, 338a; constitution, 331-332; geopolitics, 319-320, 330-331; history, 331; judiciary, 333-334; political parties, 333; World War II, 334
 Dérier, Dr., 373
 Der Fuehrer (The Leader), 163
 Dermot, King, 81
 de Sa, Prof. Hernane Tavares, 549
 de Valera, Eamon, 82-83, 86
 Díaz, Porfirio, 555
 Diet, Finnish, 336-337
 Diet of Bârgo, 336
 Dimitrov, Georgi, 474-476, 477-477c
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 16, 22
 Divisions of Yugoslavia, 439-442
 Djilas, Milovan, 454
 Dobrudja, 463, 473
 Dominion government, 67-68
 Doriot, 130
 Dragoicheva, Mrs. Tsola, 476
 Drexler, 157
 Durham, Lord, 67
 Dutra, General Eurico Gaspar, 566-567
 Dyer, General, 90
- EAM** (National Liberation Front), 497, 499, 500-501, 503
Economic Council, French, 111
Economic Reconstruction, French, 142-143
Economic Survey for 1947, 62-63
Economic system, reconstruction of the German, 172-176
Economics, Britain, 5-6; Bulgaria, 458-459; Greece, 479; Hungary, 391; Turkey, 507-509; Yugoslavia, 457
 Eden, Anthony, 500
EDES, Greece, 499
Education, in Britain, 60
 Edward I, England, 37
 Edward VII, England, 27
 Edward VIII, England, 27
 Eire (Ireland), 69, 81-86, 95a-95b
- Eisenhower, General Dwight D., 131, 184, 188, 252, 253
ELAS (Greek military), 497, 499, 500, 503
Election administration, Britain, 17-19; Canada, 71, 73; Czechoslovakia, 367-368; Eire, 84-86; France, 146-147; Germany, 180; Portugal, 294-295; Russia, 214-215; Spain, 282-283; Sweden, 325; Switzerland, 301-302
Elections, Czech, of 1946, 384-385; Greek, 496; Hungarian, 402-403; Polish, 354
Electorate, British, 15-20
Elite Guard, 158, 176, 180
 Elizabeth, Queen, 89
 Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 6
Empire, British, 67-69; continuing of, 103-107; transitional areas of, 97-103
Employment, British, 61-62
 Engels, Friedrich, 9
 Estado Novo, 293-294
 Esterhazy, Prince Paul, 392
 Estonia, cabinet, 356; constitution, 347-348; judiciary, 359
European stock in Latin America, 532
 Evatt, Dr., 68
- Fabian Society**, 22
Falange Española (Fascist Party of Spain), 279-286
Falange ideology, 280-282
Fascist ideology, 235-237
Fascist Party, in Italy, 234-235; government by, 237-248; revolution by, 233-237; in Romania, 417; in Spain, 279-286
Fatherland Front, 475-476, 477
Federal Assembly, Swiss, 302-304
Federal Council, Swiss, 304-306
Federal Tribunal, Swiss, 307-308
 Ferdinand, Archduke, Austria, 367
 Ferdinand, Francis, 436
 Ferdinand, King, Romania, 419, 421, 422
 Ferdinand, Tsar, Bulgaria, 464
 Ferdinand I, Bulgaria, 472
 Ferdinand of Coburg, Prince, 463
F.F.I. (French Forces of the Interior), 135, 142

- Fianna Fail Party, Eire, 86
 Fierlinger, Colonel Zdenek, 379, 381
 Finance, British public, 48-51
 Fine Gael (United Ireland Party), 86
 Finland, cabinet, 336; constitution, 335-336; Diet of, 336-337; geopolitics, 319-320, 335; history, 335-336; judiciary, 337-338, peace treaty, 338a-338b; president, 336; political parties, 337
 Five-Year Plans, 203-205, 227-227a
 "Folk" (German National Community), 160-162
 Folketing, 333
 Foreign Office, British, 107-108
 Foreign policy, Britain, 108-109; Czechoslovakia, 386, 386e-386f; Fascist Italy, 248-250, 264b; France, 143-144, 148b; Greece, 502-504b; Hungary, 403-405b; Nazi, 177-178; Portugal, 296; Russia, 224, 227b-227c, Sweden, 325-326; Yugoslavia, 455-456b
 Fourth Republic, French, 147-148a
 Four-Year Plan, 174
 France, constitution, 146, 148-148a; geopolitics, 113-114; history, 114-118; political parties, 124-125, 140-141
 Franchise, the British, 16-17
 Francis Joseph, Emperor, 393
 Franco, General Francisco, 267-268, rise to power, 278-279; his regime, 279-286, 288-288b
 Franco-German Armistice of June 22, 1942, 119
 Fraser, Peter, 76
 Free French Movement, 130-135
 French Empire, 144-145
 French Third Republic, 114-118

 Gama, Vasco da, 290
 Gamelin, General, 116
 Gandhi, Mohandas K., 91
 Gasperi, Alcide de, 260-261, 263
 Geopolitics, Argentina, 559-560; Brazil, 564; Britain, 1-7; Bulgaria, 458-461; Chile, 567-568; Czechoslovakia, 365-366; Denmark, 319-320, 330-331; Finland, 319-320, 335; France, 113-114; Germany, 150-151; Greece, 479-481; Hungary, 389-392; Italy, 230-231; Latin America, 530-534; Mexico, 555; Norway, 319-320, 326; Poland, 343; Portugal, 290-291; Romania, 410-413; Russia, 194, 227-227c; Spain, 266-269, 438; Sweden, 319-321; Switzerland, 298; Turkey, 506-510; Yugoslavia, 436-438
 George, David Lloyd, 25, 39
 George I, Greece, 483
 George II, Greece, 484, 494-496, 498, 501-502
 George VI, England, 27
 George of Yugoslavia, 447
 Georgiev, General Kimon, 472-474
 Germany, Allied occupation of, 181-190c; cabinet, 184-185; defeat of, 180; future of, 190c-190d, geopolitics, 150-152; history, 152-154; judiciary, 166-167; World War I, 152; World War II, 178-180
 Gilbert and Sullivan, 38
 Giraud, General Henri, 131-133
 Gladstone, 22, 23, 82, 463
 Goebbels, Joseph, 165, 180
 Goering, Hermann, 157, 164-165, 174, 180
 Golden Bull, 393
 Goldsmith, 58
 Gombos, General, 397
 Gomulka, Wladyslaw, 353
 González Videla, Dr. Gabriel, 570
 Good Neighbor Policy, 547-550
 Gottwald, Klement, 379, 384-385, 386a-386f
 Gouin, Félix, 145
 Government in exile, Greek, 498
 Governor-General of Canada, 71
 Grand Council (Italy), 238-239
 Grandi, Dino, 251
 Great Britain, *see* Britain
 Greece, American aid, 504-504b; constitution, 484-485; geopolitics, 479-481; history, 481-483; political parties, 488-490; World War I, 493
 Greek character, 485-487
 Greek republic, 494
 Grey, Earl, 39
 Grinius, Dr. Kazys, 347
 Grover, Colonel Marmaduke, 540

- Groza, Dr. Petru, 430-431; government of, 432-434b
 Gubets, Matija, 440
 Guerrilla warfare in Yugoslavia, 451-452
 Guisan, Henry, 313
Gulliver's Travels, 65-66
- Hácha, Dr. Emil, 378
 Hackzell, Antti, 338
 Hamilton, Thomas, 284
 Hastings, Warren, 89
 Hebrank, Andrij, 454
 Hedvig, Queen, 345
 Helvetic Republic, 300
 Henlein, Konrad, 371, 372, 374-376
 Henry II, England, 82
 Henry III, England, 37
 Henry VI, England, 32
 Henry VIII, England, 27, 38, 82
 Herriot, Edouard, 130
 Hertzog, General, 78
 Herzen, Alexander, 195-196
 Herzl, Theodor, 98
 Hess, Rudolph, 165
 High Court of Justice, British, 53, 111
 Himmler, Heinrich, 124, 165, 180
 Hindenburg, 154-155
 Hinduism, 87
 History, Argentina, 560; Brazil, 564-565; Britain, 3-7; Bulgaria, 462-463; Chile, 568; Czechoslovakia, 366-367; Denmark, 331; Finland, 335-336; France, 114-118; Germany, 152-154; Greece, 481-483; Hungary, 388, 392-394; Italy, 231-233; Mexico, 555-556; Norway, 326; Poland, 345; Portugal, 292; Rumania, 413-416; Russia, 194-199; Spain, 270-273; Sweden, 321-322; Switzerland, 299-300; Turkey, 514-518; Yugoslavia, 439-442
 Hitler, Adolf, 127-130, 150; rise to power, 155-159; as Fuehrer, 163-169, 249-250, 278, 365, 378-379, 474
 Hlinka, Father, 372, 373, 378
 Hodza, Dr. Milan, 373
 Home Office, British, 57
 Home Secretary, British, 31
 Horthy, Admiral Nicholas, 388; rise to power, 395-400
 House of Commons, British, 14, 41-44
 House of Lords, British, 8, 15, 38-41, 54, 62b-62c
 Housing, British, 60-61
 Hugenberg Nationalists, Germany, 156
 Hull, Cordell, 134, 550
 Humbert, Crown Prince, Italy, 255, 258, 260
 Hungary, constitution, 394-395; geopolitics, 389-392; history, 388, 392-394; judiciary, 395; political parties, 402-403; under the Nazis, 398-400; under the Russians, 400-405b
 Huss, John, 366
 Hyndman, H. M., 22
- Ideology, Communism, in Russia, 199-201; Czech political, 368-369; Fascism, in Italy, 235-237; Falange, in Spain, 280-282; Inonuism, in Turkey, 525-526; Kemalism, in Turkey, 525-526; Nazi, in Germany, 160-163
 Il Duce, 237-238
 Illiteracy, in Latin America, 534, 541
 Imrédy, Béla, 397, 399
 IMRO (International Macedonian Revolutionary Organizations), 449, 465, 469
 Independent Labor Party, British, 22
 India, 69, 86-96; in World War II, 92-93; independence, 95-95a
 Indian National Congress Party, 91-93
 Indians in Latin America, 531-532
 Indochina, French, 144-145
 Ingr, General Sergěj, 379
 Inonu, General Ismet, 518, 520-527a
 Inonuism, ideology, 525-526
 Internal troubles, Yugoslavia, 444
Iolanthe, 38, 41
 Ireland, *see* Eire
 Ireland, division of, 83
 Irish Free State, *see* Eire
 Irish Home Rule Bills, 82-83
 Irish Nationalists, 23
 Iron Guard, 417, 426-427
 Italy, and the Church, 263; constitution, 229; geopolitics, 230-231; history, 231-

- 233; judiciary, 241-243; political parties, 233-235; postwar problems, 263-264b; provisional government under the Allies, 251-255; unification of, 231-232
- Jagello, Duke, 345
- James I, England, 12
- Janissaries, 515-516
- Jaszi, Oscar, 395
- Jewish immigration to Palestine, 100-101
- Jews, Nazi treatment of, 169-170
- Jinnah, Mahomed Ali, 91
- John, King, England, 12
- JONS (Juntas Ofensivas Nacional Sindicalistes), 281-282
- Joseph, Emperor Francis, 393
- Juárez, Benito, 555
- Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 54
- Judiciary, Argentina, 561; Britain, 51-55; Czechoslovakia, 377; Denmark, 333-334; Estonia, 359; Finland, 337-338; German, 166-167; Hungary, 395; Italy, 241-243; Latin America, 542; Latvia, 359; Lithuania, 358-359; Norway, 329; Poland, 352; Russia, 215-216; Sweden, 324-325; Switzerland, 307-308
- Justice of the Peace, British, 53
- Kaiser Wilhelm II, 365
- Kallay, Nicholas, 399
- Kapp Putsch, 157
- Kara-George, 440
- Kardelj, Edvard, 454
- Karolyi, Count Guyla, 397
- Karolyi, Michael, 395
- Kemel Ataturk, *see* Ataturk
- Kemelists, 511, 521-524
- Kerensky, Alexander, 197-198
- Keynes, John M., 2
- Kiel, Peace of, 326
- King, Mackenzie, 68, 72
- Kings, of Britain, 15, 27-29; Bulgaria, 464; Denmark, 332; Norway, 327; Sweden, 322
- King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, 54
- Kirov, S. M., 208
- Kohn, Hans, 526
- Kondylis, General George, 495-496
- Košice program, 383-384
- Kosovo Spirit, 439-440
- Kossuth, Louis, 399
- Kramer, Dr., 371
- Kun, Bela, 395, 403
- Kurds, 512-513
- Kwangchowan, 145
- Labor Charter, Italy, 246, 282
- Labor Front, Germany, 174-175
- Labor organizations in Latin America, 539
- Labor Party, Australia, 75; Britain, 18-27, 41, 100; New Zealand, 76; South Africa, 78
- Labor Representative Committee, 22-23
- Lagting, 328
- Landsgemeinde, 310
- Landsting, 333
- Land system in Latin America, 533
- Language, Bulgarian, 460-461; Greek, 487
- Latimer, 12
- Latin America, geopolitics, 530-534; judiciary, 542; recent trends, 570-570b; World War II, 550-553
- Latvia, cabinet, 356; constitution, 348; judiciary, 359
- Lausanne, Treaty of, 511, 518
- Laval, Pierre, 118, 120-124, 127-130
- Law, British, 51-54
- Lawrence, T. E., 99
- Lazar, Gheorghe, 414
- Leader of His Majesty's Opposition, 44
- Lebensraum*, 160, 162
- Lebrun, Albert, 116
- Legislature, Argentina, 560; Finland, 336-337; Germany, 153, 166; Hungary, 394; Poland, 350-351
- Lenin, Nikolai, 197-203
- Ley, Dr. Robert, 174
- Liberal Party, Australia, 75; Britain, 18-27; Canada, 72
- Liberation, Greek, 498-500

- Liberation Movement, Czech, 379-380
 Lithuania, cabinet, 355; constitution, 346-347; judiciary, 358-359
 Local government, Britain, 55-57; Bulgaria, 464-465; Canada, 73; Czechoslovakia, 376-377; Denmark, 334; Estonia, 359-360; Finland, 338; Hungary, 395; Italy, 243-244; Latin America, 542; Latvia, 360; Lithuania, 359; Norway, 329; Poland, 352; Romania, 418; Russia, 213; Turkey, 519-520
 Locke, John, 2, 13
 London, governments of, 56-57
 London Workingmen's Association, 14
 Lord Chancellor, British, 31, 39, 40, 53
 Lord President of the Council, British, 31
 Lords, House of, 8, 15, 38-41, 54
 Lords Justices of Appeal, 53
 Lords of Appeal in Ordinary, 40, 53
 Lords Temporal, 38
 Lovett, William, 14
 Luca, Laszlo Vasile, 432
 Ludendorff, General, 157
 Lugard, F. D., 104
- Macauley, Lord, 89
 MacDonald, Ramsay, 25-26
 Madero, Francisco, 555
 Madison, James, 20-21
 Magna Carta, 12
 Magyar rebellion, 441
 Mahmud II, Turkey, 516
 Maniu, Iuliu, 421-422, 429, 434a
 Mannerheim, Baron, 338
 Maquis, 142
 March on Rome, 234, 245
 Marghiloman, Alexandry, 418
 Marie, Queen, Romania, 419, 420, 422
 Markos, General, 504a
 Marshall Plan, Britain, 62a-62b; Czechoslovakia, 386b; France, 184b; Italy, 264b
 Marx, Karl, 9, 199, 201
 Masaryk, Jan, 379, 386, 386e-386f
 Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue, 363, 367, 373
 Master of the Rolls, 53
- Matchek, Dr. Vladimir, 444, 449, 450, 452
 Maurras, André, 121
 Maximilian, 555
 Maximos, Demetrios, 504-504b
 McFarlane, General Mason, 253
 McMahon, 99
Mein Kampf, 158
 Menzies, Robert Gordon, 75
 Metaxas, John, 493, 496, 502
 Mexico, constitution, 556-559; geopolitics, 555; political parties, 559
 Michael, Romania, 434a-434b
 Michael the Brave, 410, 414
 Mihai (Michael), 421, 423, 428, 430, 432
 Mihailoff, 449, 469
 Mikhailovitch, Draja, 451-452, 456
 Miklós, General Béla, 400
 Mikolajczyk, Stanislaw, 353
 Militarism, Germany, 176-177
 Mill, John Stuart, 10, 36
 Milton, John, 12-13
 Mindszenty, Cardinal, 403
 Ministries, British, 32-35
 Minorities, in the Balkans, 460; Bulgaria, 460-461; Czechoslovakia, 366, 373-376; Germany, 185; Hungary, 390; Romania, 412-413; Spain, 269; Turkey, 513-514; Yugoslavia, 438-439
 Molotov, Vyacheslav M., 430
 Monroe Doctrine, 545-547
 Montagu, Edwin, 90
 Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms of 1919, 90
 Montevideo Conference, 548
 Montoire Conference, 127-128
 Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909, 90
 Moroccan campaign, 274
 Morrison, Herbert, 30
 Morrow, Dwight W., 547
 Moslem law, 51
 Moslem League, 91, 93
 Moslems, 87
 Motta, Giuseppi, 307
 Movement of National Liberation, 140
 Munich Pact, 398
 Munich surrender, 377
 Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, 55

- Mussolini, Benito, rise to power, 234-237; as Il Duce, 237-248; fall of, 250-251, 278
- Nágy, N., 402, 405a
- Natal, 77
- National Assembly, French, 111-112
- National Council, Spain, 282; Switzerland, 302-303
- National Council of the Republic, French, 111-113
- National Democratic Front, Romania, 432
- National Health Insurance, British, 59
- National Party, Boer, 78
- National Socialist Germany, and the churches, 171-172; economic program, 169-176; foreign policy, 177-178; government of, 161-169; revolution of, 154-159; *see also* Nazi
- National Socialist Party, Czech, 381
- National Unity Government, Poland, 355
- Native States of India, 88-89, 95
- Nazi, ideology, 160-162; repression in France, 125; rule in Hungary, 398-399; rule in Yugoslavia, 450-451; social and economic program, 169-172; *see also* National Socialist Germany
- Nazis, in Czechoslovakia, 374-379; in France, 117-130; in Hungary, 396-397; purge of, 188
- Neditch, General Milan, 450
- Negroes in Latin America, 532; in South Africa, 79-80
- Nehru, 93, 95
- Nenni, Pietro, 259, 263
- Neutrality, Swiss, 314
- Newfoundland, 67, 97
- New Zealand, 76
- Nicholas, Grand Duke, 346
- Nicholas II, Russia, 197
- Nicola, Enrico de, 260
- Niemoller, Martin, 172
- North Africa, French, 131
- Norway, cabinet, 327; constitution, 327; geopolitics, 319-320, 326; history, 326; judiciary, 329; political parties, 328; recent trends, 338a; World War II, 330
- Nosek, Vaclav, 386
- Nuremberg trials, 187
- Obrenovitch, Alexander, 447
- O'Connell, Daniel, 82
- Odelsting, 328
- Old Bailey, London, 54
- Orange Free State, 77
- Osobka-Morawski, Edward, 353
- Osusky, Stefan, 379
- Otto I, Greece, 483-484
- Ottocar II, Czechoslovakia, 366
- Ottoman Empire, 515
- OZNA (Yugoslavia police), 454
- Paets, 361
- Paine, Tom, 28
- Paissey, Monk, 462
- Pakistan, 88, 91, 93-94
- Palestine, 98-103
- Pan-American relations, 543-550
- Pandit, Madame, 80
- Pangalos, General, 490, 492, 495
- Pankhurst, Emmeline, 16
- Papandreou, George, 498
- Papen, Franz von, 155
- Parliament, Britain, 11, 19-27, 37-48; Czechoslovakia, 363, 367-368; Denmark, 333; Eire, 84; Estonia, 357; Irish, 81; Latvia, 357-358; Lithuania, 356; Norway, 327-328; Yugoslavia, 445-447
- Parri, Feruccio, 259
- Parties, political, in Argentina, 561-563; Australia, 75; Brazil, 566-567; Britain, 20-27; Bulgaria, 474-477; Canada, 72-73; Chile, 568-570; Czechoslovakia, 369-376, 378, 381-382; Denmark, 333; Estonia, 358; Finland, 337; France, 124-125, 140-141; Germany, 157-159; Greece, 488-490; Hungary, 401-402; Italy, 233-235, 256, 258; Latvia, 358; Lithuania, 357-358; Mexico, 559; Norway, 328; Poland, 351-352; Portugal, 292-293; Romania, 418-421; Russia, 208-209; Spain, 272-273; Sweden, 323-

- 324; Switzerland, 311-312; Yugoslavia, 453
- Partisans, 452-453
- Party of National Union, 294-295
- Pasha, Enver, 522
- Pashitch, Nicholas, 444
- Passage of bills in the English Parliament, 39-40, 43-49
- Patrascanu, Lucretiu, 429
- Pauker, Ana, 432
- Paul of Yugoslavia, 449, 450
- Pavelitch, Dr. Ante, 449, 450
- Peasant Party, Polish, 354
- Peasants, Bulgaria, 470-471
- Peers, House of, *see* House of Lords
- People's Council, 454
- Pericles, Peace of, 6
- Permanent secretaries, British, 33, 36
- Perón, Juan D., 552-553, 561-564
- Pétain, Marshal Henri Philippe, 116, 118, 120-123, 127, 130
- Peter I, Yugoslavia, 442, 451-453
- Pethick-Lawrence, Lord, 31, 93
- Petition of Rights, 12
- Petkov, Mikola, 477c
- Petrescu, Constantin, 429
- Petrovic, George, 440
- Peyeff, General, 473
- Phanariotes, 414-415
- Physical Planning and Housing, British, 60-61
- Pijade, Moshe, 454
- Pika, Colonel, 379
- Pilsudski, Marshal Joseph, 342, 346, 349-350
- Planning, British postwar, 58-62
- Plassey, Battle of, 89
- Plastiras, Nicholas, 490, 492, 494, 495, 500
- Platt Amendment, 548
- Poland, cabinet, 349-350; constitution, 345-346; geopolitics, 343; history, 345; judiciary, 352; political parties, 351, 360-360b; under Germany in World War II, 348-349; under Russia in World War II, 348-349; World War II, 352
- Police, Czechoslovakia, 384
- Policies, British postwar, 58-62
- Polish government in exile, 353
- Political developments, in France, 126-127; Latin America, 535-536
- Political parties, *see* Parties, political
- Political structure of India, 88
- Political trends, Hungary, 401-402
- Politics, Background of Spanish, 269-273; Latin America, 554; Turkish, 520
- Pope Pius XI, 86
- Popular Democrats, France, 140
- Popular Republican Movement, France, 140, 145
- Portugal, and the Church, 295; constitution, 294; geopolitics, 290-291; history, 292; political parties, 292-293; recent trends, 296-296a
- Post Office, British, 34-35
- Potsdam Conference, 184-186, 188-189, 354
- Potsdam Declaration, 225-226, 261-262
- Premier, of France, 111, 112
- President, of Czechoslovakia, 363; Eire, 84; Estonia, 355-356; Finland, 336; France, 111, 112; Latin America, 536-538; Latvia, 356, Lithuania, 355; Poland, 349-350
- Press, purge of the French, 141-142
- Preuss, Hugo, 153
- Prime Minister, of Australia, 74-75; Britain, 11, 14, 29-30, 39, 48; Canada, 71; Eire, 84
- Privy Council, British, 32, 54
- Pro-Fascists, French purge of, 133-134
- Progressive Conservative Party, Canadian, 72
- Provisional Consultative Assembly, France, 133
- Provisional government, in Canada, 73; France, 135-147
- Provincialism, in Spain, 271
- Public opinion, in Bulgaria, 468; Greece, 487-488; Latin America, 541-542
- Purge, of Brown Shirts, 158; French press, 141-142; French pro-Fascists, 133-134; German civil service, 165; Nazis, 188; Vichy collaborators, 141

- Quadragesimo Anno*, 86
 Question Hour, British, 47-48, 106
 Quiroga, Casares, 278
 Quisling, Vidkun, 330
- Races in Turkey, 511-512
 Race question in South Africa, 79-80
 Racial supremacy, principles of German, 160
 Radical Socialist Party, France, 140
 Raditch, Stephen, 444, 446-447
 Ragged Guard, 398
 Rákosi, 402
 Ramadier, Paul, 148-148b
 Ramírez, Pedro P., 561
 Rankovitch, Alexander, 454
 Rapallo Treaty, 224
 Rawson, Arturo, 561
 Reconstruction, in Russia, 218-224
 Referendum, Swiss, 309
 Reformation Parliament of 1529, 38
 Reform Bill of 1832, 16, 17, 39
 Reform Bill of 1867, 16
 Regency, Greek, 500
 Reichsrat, 153, 166
 Reichstag, 153, 166
 Religion, of Bulgaria, 461
 Reparations, Germany, 186-187
 Republican Militia, 142
 Republic of Spain, 275-277
 Republics, in France, Fourth, 111-113, 147-148a; Third, 114-118; Socialist Soviet, 210
Rerum Novarum, 85
 Resistance Movement, French, 139-140
 Reynaud, Paul, 116, 118
 Rhodes, Cecil, 77
 Riksdag, 321, 322-324
 Ríos, Juan Antonio, 569
 Ripka, Hubert, 379
 Rivera, General Miguel Primo de, 270
 Rivera, José Antonio Primo de, 280-281
 Rivera, Pilar Primo de, 284
 Rodino, Giulio, 257
 Romania, constitution, 416-417; geopolitics, 410-413; history, 413-416; political parties, 418-421; recent events, 434-434b; World War I, 415; World War II, 415-416, 428-434
- Roman law, 51
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., 49, 430, 547, 548
 Rossoni, Edmondo, 245
 Ruadan, Bishop, 81
 Rudolph, the Black Prince, 410
 Runnymede, 12
 Russia, agricultural problems, 222; constitution, 209-217; geopolitics, 194, 227-227c; history, 194-199; industrial education, 222; industrial problems, 221; judiciary, 215-216; political parties, 208-209; postwar planning, 218-221; power politics, Eastern Europe, 227b; religion in, 223-224; territorial gains, 225-226; trends, recent, internal, 227-227a; Turkish relations, 526-527d; World War II, 217-218
- S.A. (Storm Troopers), 176
 Saint Stephen, 392
 Salazar, Antonio de Oliveira, 278, 292; dictator of Portugal, 293-296a
 Salgado, Plinio, 567
 Sanatescu, 429
 San Martin, Grau, 540
 Savage, J. M., 76
 Secret Police, Russia, 217
 Seima, Latvia, 357; Lithuania, 356
 Sejm, Poland, 350-351
 Seljuk, Kingdom of, 515
 Senate, of Canada, 72; Italy, 241
 Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, 89
 Sèvres, Treaty of, 511
 Sforza, Count Carlo, 256
 Shaw, George Bernard, 22
 Siegfried, André, 536
 Sikhs, 87
 Simeon II, Bulgaria, 473, 474, 477
 Simon Commission, 91
 Simovitch, General Dushan, 450
 Sinn Fein, 82-83
 Slanský, 379
 Smetona, 357, 361
 Smigly-Rydz, Marshal, 342
 Smith, Adam, 9
 Smuts, Jan Christian, 68, 78, 86
 Social aspects of Bulgarian politics, 465-467

- Social conditions, in the Balkans, 459;
Bulgaria, 459-460; Greece, 480, 487;
Hungary, 391; Romania, 411-412, 424-
425; Turkey, 509-510; Yugoslavia, 437,
444-445
- Social Credit Party, Canada, 72-73
- Social Democratic Federation, Britain,
22
- Socialism, in Bulgaria, 469
- Socialist Party, France, 145-147; Spain,
376
- Socialization, in England, 61-62
- Social legislation, in New Zealand, 76
- Social policy, in Eire, 85
- South Africa, 77-81
- South African Party, 78
- Southern Rhodesia, 97
- Soviet workers, 223
- Spain, and the Church, 271-272; geopol-
itics, 266-269, 438; history, 270-273;
political parties, 272-273; recent
events, 288-288b
- Speaker of the British House of Com-
mons, 42-43
- Special Committee, British Parliament,
46
- Speech from the Throne, England, 47
- Spencer, Herbert, 2, 108
- Spiritual Peers, 38, 47
- Spoletto, Duke of, 450
- Sramek, Msgr., 371, 372, 381
- S.S., *see* Elite Guard
- Stalin, Josef, 199, 207, 430
- Stambuliski, 459, 464, 467, 472
- Standing Committee, British Parlia-
ment, 46
- State Planning Commission, Russia, 218
- Statute of Westminster (1931), 54
- Statuto* (Constitution), Italy, 232
- Stefanik, General, 367
- Stephen, Saint, 392
- Stepinatz, Archbishop, 453
- Stipendiary Magistrates, British, 53
- Stirbey, Prince Barbu, 429
- Storm Troopers, 157
- Storting, 327
- Stoyadinovitch, Dr., 449
- Student activities in Latin America, 540-
541
- Stulginskis, Aleksandras, 347
- Subasitch, 453
- Suffrage, in England, 15-20
- Suleiman I, Turkey, 515
- Suñer, Serrano, 282
- Supreme Council of the Union, Russia,
211-212
- Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., 211-213
- Svehla, Antonin, 370, 371
- Svoboda, General, 380
- Sweden, cabinet, 322; constitution, 322;
geopolitics, 319-321; history, 321-322;
judiciary, 324-325; recent trends, 338-
338a
- Swift (*Gulliver's Travels*), 65-66
- Swiss Confederation, *see* Switzerland
- Switzerland, constitution, 300-301, 317a;
contributions to political science,
299; geopolitics, 298; history, 299-300;
judiciary, 307-308; political parties,
311; recent events, 317-317a; struc-
ture, 302-304; World War II, 313, 315
- Sylvester II, Pope, 392
- Syrov, General, 377
- Szalasi, Ferenc, 400
- Szlachta, Margaret, 403
- Szotajay, Doeme, 399
- Tamborini, José P., 563
- Tatarescu, George, 427, 431
- Teleki, Count Paul, 397, 399
- Temple, William, 9
- Temporal Lords, 38
- Tesnyak Party, 474
- Third International, 208-209
- Third Republic, Spain, 275-278
- Thorez, Maurice, 147
- Tildy, Zoltan, 402
- Tiso, Father, 372, 378-379, 386
- Tisza, Count Stephan, 395
- Tito, 432, 443; government of, 453-456b
- Togliatti, Palmiro, 257
- Tomislav I, Croatia, 451
- Tory, British party, 21
- Trajan, Emperor, Romania, 413
- Transvaal, 77
- Treasury, British, 48-51
- Trianon, Treaty of, 394

- Trotsky, 197, 198, 203; Truman Doctrine, in Greece, 504-504b, in Turkey, 527b
- Truman, Harry S., 102
- Tsaldaris, Constantin, 501-504
- Tsaldaris, Panagiotis, 495
- Tsars, Russia under the, 194-198
- Tsolakoglov, 497
- Tuka, Dr. Béla, 372
- Turkey, constitution, 519; foreign relations, 527b-527d; geopolitics, 506-510; history, 514-518; recent domestic trends, 527-527a; Russian relations, 526-527, 527b-527d; World War I, 518
- Tusar, Premier, 371
- Ulmanis, Karlis, 357, 361
- Unified Trade Union, Czechoslovakia, 382
- Union of South Africa, *see* South Africa
- United Kingdom, *see* Britain
- United Nations, and Argentina, 562; Britain, 68; British foreign policy, 108-109, Charter of, 66-67, 80; France, 194; Greece, 503-504; Latin America, 552; Poland, 352, Spain, 286-288, Switzerland, 314
- United Nations Conference on International Organization, 80
- U S S.R., *see* Russia
- Vargas, Getulio, 293-294, 554, 565-566
- Veesenmayer, Edmund, 400
- Venizelos, Eleutherios, 490-495, 500
- Ventila, 421
- Vereeniging, Peace of, 77
- Vichy collaborators, French purge of, 141
- Vichy regime, in France, 118-130
- Victor Emmanuel II, 231
- Victor Emmanuel III, 234, 254
- Victoria, Queen, 27, 89
- Videla, Dr. Gabriel González, 570
- Vidovdan Constitution, 442
- Vishinsky, Andrei, 430
- Volkssturm (People's Army), 176
- von Papen, Franz, 155
- von Ribbentrop, Joachim, 165
- von Schleicher, General, 155
- Voulgaris, Admiral Petros, 500
- Wahlen Plan, 314
- Walpole, Sir Robert, 13, 29
- War Council, Germany, 164
- War criminals, punishment of German, 188
- Webb, Sidney, 22
- Weichs, Maximilian von, 400
- Weimar Constitution, 152-154
- Weygand, General Maxime, 118
- Whig, British party, 21
- Whips, in House of Commons, 43-44
- Wilberforce, William, 103
- William II, Germany, 152
- Wilson, Woodrow, 346
- Witan, 37
- Witenagemots, 37
- Wollstonecraft, Mary, 16
- Women's suffrage, British, 14, 16-17
- Woolsack, 39
- Worker's Party, Germany, 157
- Xites, Greek Royalists, 502
- Yalta Conference and Agreement, 353, 430
- Yevtitch, 449
- Yugoslavia, constitution, 442-443; geopolitics, 436-438; history, 439-442; political parties, 453, recent trends, 455-456b; World War I, 441
- Zaimis, 491
- Zamora, Alcalá, 277
- Zapotocky, 382
- Zdedenyi, Béla, 400
- Zeligowski, 347
- Zhivkovitch, Pera, 448-449
- Zhujevitch, Sreten, 454
- "Zinoviev letter," 25
- Zionists, 98-102
- Zlateff, Petko, 473